

1019.d.118  
A  
DEFENCE  
OF THE  
Reasonableness

OF  
Conformity  
TO THE  
Church of *ENGLAND*, &c.  
In Answer to the  
Objections of Mr. *CALAMY*  
In his Defence of  
Moderate Non-Conformity.

With a Reply to his *Postscript* in Answer to the *Serious Admonition*.

BY BENJAMIN HOADLY, M.A.

LONDON: Printed by H. Clark, for Tim. Child, at the *White-Hart* at the West End of St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1705.



DEEDS

OF THE

RESPONSE

CONFIDENTIAL

TO THE

CHURCH OF THE LATTER

DAY

OF THE LATTER

DAY

OF THE LATTER

DAY

OF THE LATTER

DAY

OF THE LATTER

DAY

OF THE LATTER

DAY

# PREFACE.

**I**N the following Papers I have once more endeavoured to set the Cause of Ministerial Conformity in a due Light; and to vindicate it from the unaccountable Mistakes, and Mis-representations of Mr. Canny. I have been forced likewise to add a Reply to one of his Postscripts, in my own justification: which I hope, may be pardoned to that concern every Man ought to have for his

## P R E F A C E.

*own Reputation, when it is affected in the tenderest Points.*

*How just his Pretences to Candour, and Temper, are; and how truly He assured the World in his last Preface, that He had avoided what He thought might Heat, and Exasperate; will appear from almost every one of the following Pages. And if any should want farther Satisfaction in this Point, let them consult the Index at the end of Mr. Olyffe's Second Defence, which gives an Account of some Peculiarities in Mr. Calamy's manner of Writing in this Controversy.*

## P R E F A C E

I am sensible that some Passages in this Defence may seem obscure, thro' that Dependence it must necessarily have, upon what hath been before Written in this Cause. And therefore, I wish that every one who gives Himself the trouble of looking into it, would be so just, as to have recourse, upon all occasions, to what hath been already Published on each side.

The Introduction to Mr. Calamy's Second Part ought to have a particular, and distinct Reply, for the sake of that value which He himself, and many of his Readers seem to set



## P R E F A C E.

*set upon it. And accordingly, I have already prepared a full and distinct Examination of it; which I had once resolved to prefix to these Papers. But considering that the main Argument of it, concerns not the Conformity of Ministers so much as the Compliance of the Laity, I thought it better to reserve it for the Reply I must make to the Third Part of his Defence, which will handle that Point. And in the mean while, whoever will consult Mr. Ollyffe's Second Defence of Ministerial Conformity, (from p. 45.*

## P R E F A C E.

to p. 90.) may be fully convinced how great a Contradiction it is to the Principles, that have been hitherto publickly Espoused by those whose Cause Mr. Calamy pretends to plead; and how little is there advanced in Justification of Moderate Nonconformity.

I think my self Obliged, once at least, to review what I have Written in this Cause; and to endeavour to free it from all Objections, and Misrepresentations. But if Mr. Calamy have so deceived himself, as not to think it worth his while to alter his method of Controversie,

## P R E F A C E.

verſie, I know not to what pur-  
poſe I ſhould take any notice of  
any Future Replies He may  
make; Eſpecially ſince I can  
not perſuade my ſelf to An-  
ſwer his Wiſhes, and treat  
Him with a like Temper to  
that with which He hath ſer-  
viced me.

Deſ. P.

II. Pref. make;

P. 6.

A D

A

# DEFENCE

OF THE

Reasonableness

OF

CONFORMITY, &c.

To Mr. CALAMY.

SIR,

Have here sent you my *Remarks* upon your *Defence of Moderate Non-conformity*: Which I thought necessary to do, in Justice, both to myself, and to the *Cause of Truth*. And shall not detain you from them any longer,

B



## A Defence of the

longer, than whilst I entreat you to examine them with such Candour, and Impartiality, as becomes a *Christian*, and a *Divine*.

---

## C H A P. I.

### Of Episcopal Ordination.

**I**T may be expected that I should here Discourse as largely concerning *Episcopal Ordination* as you have given me occasion to do, in the *First Part* of your *Defence*. But I chuse rather to refer the complete handling of that Subject to a distinct *Treatise*; which may quickly follow these *Papers*. And, *that*, what I have already said with relation to the Point of *Ordination*, shall be confirmed, and defended; and whatever you have advanced on that Head shall be fairly, and thoroughly considered. And I may the rather be permitted to do this, because this *Subject* is of very little concern to the *Cause* between *Us*, how considerable soever it be in itself. For you must be sensible, (as I will

### Reasonableness of Conformity.

3

willing as you are, that I should be thought by your *Readers* to state the *Question* aright) that, supposing an *Original Right* in *Presbyters* to *Ordain* be granted; and supposing all you have said against the peculiar *Right* of *Bishops* to be true: Yet still the *Exercise* of this *Right* may be *indefensible* in *You*; and the present *Right* of *Bishops* stand unmoved, as long as you acknowledge the lawfulness of the present Method; unless you will put the whole upon the *Necessity* of your *Separation*, and prove the *Obligation* *You* are under now, of claiming and exercising this *Right*. This is what the *Question* now depending (as you have stated it your self) must be resolved into, at last. For *Moderate Nonconformity* can never be proved justifiable, but by demonstrating that *Necessity* and *Obligation*. And you must give me leave to say it again, that this *Necessity*, and *Obligation* can never be demonstrated, but by demonstrating that *Constant Lay-Conformity* to the *Established Church* is *circumstantially unlawful*. I might, therefore, here, only observe that whatever you have hitherto written in *Defence* of *Moderate Nonconformity* touches

B 2

## A Defence of the

toucheth not the Point: And so wait for the only *material* part of the *Controversy*, which is yet behind. For it doth not follow, that because your *Re-ordination* is a hard, and unreasonable Term, therefore, the *People* are obliged to separate from our *Church*. It doth not follow, that because *You* cannot comply with the other *Terms* of *Ministerial Conformity*, therefore the *Nonconformity* of your *People* is *justifiable*. But, because one end I proposed to my self in Writing, was a *Vindication* of our own *Conformity*, who are *Ministers* in this *Church*, I therefore think my self obliged to consider what you have again advanced against the *Terms* of *Ministerial Conformity*: But I must premise this: *Adversity*, that granting the *Truth* of a you have said against these *Terms*, you are not advanced one Step towards the Proof of the *affirmative* side of your *Question*; and that should this Reply be as weak, and insignificant as you have represented my former Writings to be, it would still remain upon *You*, to justify the *Nonconformity* of your *People*, to give up your *Cause*. It being, therefore, for our own *Vindication*, that

now consider again these *Terms* of *Ministerial Conformity* (and not because they belong to the *Question*, as you your self have stated it) it is sufficient for my purpose to observe concerning the *First* of them, *viz. Episcopal Ordination*, that you your selves allow it *Lawfull*: And, therefore, in submitting to *that*, we do nothing, but what you your selves acknowledge it *Lawfull* to do; and what you your selves would do, were it not for some *accidental Circumstances*, not touching the *lawfullness* of the thing it self. And so I may with the greater liberty pass on to the other *Terms* of *Ministerial Conformity*, scrupled by *You*, and your Brethren.

---

## C H A P.



## C H A P. II.

*Of the Declaration of Assent and Consent; and the Subscription.*

Sect. 1. *Of the Subscription.*

THE first Thing you are pleased to find fault with in my Book upon this Head, is, that I say, that never heard that the Subscription was esteem'd any considerable difficulty. Upon which, you let the World know, how necessary it is to join *History*, and *Argument together*, without which frequent Mistakes will be unavoidable in a Debate of this nature. And presently, you give us a historical Account of the Subscription that have been required; and of the Scruples of those whom you call your *Predecessors* about them: Which I venture to affirm, to be of no concern the Debate between us, but rather tend to the reviving former Animosities amongst us. The Debate

## Reasonableness of Conformity.

7

tween us is, in your own Words, whether *Moderate Nonconformity* be justifiable. Now supposing the *Subscription* required in 1603. hath been esteemed a *considerable difficulty*, it toucheth not this *Debate*: Because that will not prove either that the *Objections* against it are reasonable; or that you are obliged to follow your *Predecessors* in their *Opinions* concerning it; or, that you must, therefore, *separate* from the *Church* of *England*. Much less will the *History* of other *Subscriptions* required before this, prove any thing of this nature; or so much as that I am mistaken, in saying, that this last *Subscription* hath not been esteem'd any considerable difficulty. But, in order to shew the World how free you are of your *Historical Collection* of this nature (that may draw the Readers Mind aside from the main Point, but can never enlighten it) I must tell you, what you your self could not but know, that I was there speaking only of the *Ejected*, and present *Nonconforming Ministers*; and of this *Subscription* since the time of the *Act* of *Uniformity*. Now you allow your self what I say, that it hath not been spoken

B 4

of

of since that time, as *any considerable Difficulty*. And then, to what purpose was it to give us an *History of Rigours*, and *Scruples*, all before the *Time* plainly intended? Or, how can *this* shew that the *ejected Ministers* have since 1662, represented the *Subscription*, about which we are speaking, as a *considerable Difficulty*; unless you will say, they must be supposed to approve and practice, every thing said, and done in former Days. This *Historical Account*, therefore, cannot be necessary to the *Debate* between us, nor the least Proof that I was mistaken when I supposed, that it was not ever *esteemed any considerable Difficulty*, by the Persons I was concerned with. And if you will now say in the name of your *Brethren*, that it is at present so esteemed; yet what I said may be true: And I can easily believe you without the *uneasiness* of reading of *Rigours*, and *Worryings*, and *Silencings*, long since past: Long enough indeed to be forgotten by all who study *Peace and Charity*.

But however this be, methinks you should not have wholly neglected what I offered, to shew that the *Subscription* could

## Reasonableness of Conformity.

9

could not reasonably be esteemed any considerable Difficulty, by any who thought the *Common-prayer-book* fit to be used in the Public Service of God, and the Administration of the Sacraments. And I cannot imagine it should be esteemed, even by You, an unreasonable Term, or, in the least injurious, either to the Worship of God, or to the due Administration of the Sacraments, that all who Minister in the Established Church, should promise to use this *Liturgy*: Since you your selves, as I shall have occasion to shew hereafter, have professed a readiness to comply constantly with one particular *Liturgy*; and no Term can be so framed, as that some, or other shall not scruple it. But let us return to the Declaration of Assent and Consent.

Act. 2. Of the true Interpretation of this Declaration.

IN order to shew that this Declaration extended only to the Use of the *Common-prayer-book*, I observed that the Act it self requires us to confine this Assent and Consent both, to the Use only



## *A Defence of the*

only of this Book. The *Paragraph* then referr'd to is the most considerable, and ought to be of the greatest force, in this *Debate*, of any *Paragraph*, in the whole *Act*: Because it is the *Paragraph* immediately going before the *Declaration* itself, and professedly undertaking to determine the Sense of the *Words* required to be used upon this occasion. And that all Persons may judge of the weight of this *Argument*, I shall here transcribe part of the *Paragraph* I speak of. *And to the end that Uniformity in the Public Worship of God may be speedily effected (which Uniformity may certainly be effected by the use only of one Form of Publick Worship; from whence we may draw another Argument to establish our Sense) Be it Enacted, that every Parson, &c. shall openly read the Common-Prayer, and after such reading thereof, shall openly, and publickly, declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent, (both) to the use of all things in the said Book contained, and prescribed, these words, and no other. Then follow the Form of Words to be used. No* it is hardly possible to believe, that, it had been the design of our Legislature then Assembled, that both *Assent*

## Reasonableness of Conformity.

Consent should not be confined to the use of the *Common-Prayer-Book*, they themselves would have so confined them in the *principal* Paragraph in the whole *Act*, and leave their true Sense and Intention to be discovered in another, less observable, and less important Paragraph. But that this may not seem a Mistake, or Oversight in them, it is again repeated in the next Paragraph but one, that every Person who shall hereafter be Collated to any Benefice, &c. shall declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent, (both to the use of all things, &c. I know not what can be more evident than this, and yet I see you think yourself obliged still to oppose this Sense; not by denying that these Expressions are in the *Act*, or that they do not so confine the Declaration of Assent and Consent; for these things are too plain to be denied: But by other Arguments. Before, therefore, I proceed to consider your Reasonings against the Sense of the Declaration, I lay down this, which you have not yet in the least endeavoured to contradict or disprove, viz. That the *Act* it self, which requires this Declaration of Assent and Consent, doth, in plain and express words, and

## A Defence of the

and such as are not capable of any other Interpretation, confine this *Assent* and *Consent*, both, to the *use* of the *Common-Prayer-Book*; and that in the two *Principal Paragraphs* of the whole *Act*, the one immediately going before the *Declaration* it self, and the other presently following it. Who would not think that it were sufficient Satisfaction to any understanding Men to see this with their Eyes? Or, who would think it worth any Persons while to search out any Arguments against so plain a Matter? But I come now to examine of what force your Objections are, in comparison of the weight of this plain *Proposition*.

Your *first Objection* is, that it is scarce supposable that this *Declaration* was designed to respect the *use* only of the *Common-Prayer-Book*, because the constant use of it was required long before the *Act* of *Uniformity* was framed. But what can it avail, to argue from a probability against *express words*? Or from what we think *ought* to be done in a case, to what is actually done? I will give you an Instance out of this very *Act*, and such an one as was never controverted by you, to put it past all doubt

that this *Argument* of yours is of no force. *Constant Conformity* to the *Common-Prayer-Book*, was required long before this *Act of Uniformity* was framed; and yet one thing required of *Ministers* by this *Act*, is to subscribe this *Declaration*, that they will conform to the *Liturgy* of the *Church of England*, as it is now by *Law* *Established*. What will you say therefore? that to conform to the *Liturgy*, must not respect only the *use* of it, because this was required long before? Or, that the *Parliament* hath actually required it again, tho' it were required before? If so, then the *Declaration* of *Assent* and *Consent* may as well respect only the *use*, notwithstanding your *Argument*. Nay, you tell us your self in this *Book*, p. 124. That a *Consent* is supposed to have gone before; and that the *Subscription* is an *Engagement* to use the *Common-Prayer*. And let you acknowledge that this *Engagement* is here repeated, and required so to be in this word *Consent*. Why, therefore, may it not be repeated in the word *Assent* also? Or, why will you argue from hence that something more must be intended, when you must own your



your self, that notwithstanding the Engagement by *Subscription* to use the *Liturgy*, the *Parliament* hath enforced it in this *Act* by another *Subscription*, and *Declaration of Conformity* to it, and by *Consent* to it? Is it not probable from hence, that *Assent* also may mean the same thing, (nothing being pretended from any plain words in the *Act* to the contrary) rather than that something farther is meant by this *single* word? But it rather seems to have been the design of our *Legislators*, when all things had been out of Course, and Alterations were made in the *Liturgy*, to bring Men under greater and more solemn Obligations to a *constant* use of it. As long as I think the *constant use* of lawful, I shall be ready to promise to it, as often, and after as different manners, as my *Governours* are ever likely oblige me to do it. One thing more have to offer upon this Head, that you argue from the *Subscription* required before, that this *Declaration* must intend something more than *use*: From whence I collect, that it is your Opinion that *Subscription* extends to nothing but *use* of the *Common-Prayer-Book*, and

the *Approbation* of it, as distinct from the *use*. For if it extend to the *Approbation*, then your Argument here will extend to it likewise, and prove against your self, that the *Approbation* of the *Common-Prayer-Book* cannot be intended in this *Declaration*, because *that was required long before the Act of Uniformity was performed*. So that, whether the *Subscription*, before required, extend to the *use* only, or to the *Approbation* also of the *Common-prayer-book*, here is a plain Answer given to your Argument taken from thence: And so I leave you to answer for your *Reflexions* upon our *Legislators*.

Your *Second Argument* against Con-  
sisting Assent and Consent to the *use* only  
of the *Established Liturgy*, is this, that  
the *Legislators themselves have declared*  
against this *Sense*. My Proposition be-  
fore laid down, is this, that they have,  
themselves, so confined them, in the two  
principal Paragraphs of this very *Act*,  
in which chiefly we are obliged to look  
after their *Sense*. But who would not  
think by what you at first allege here,  
that they had in as publick a manner  
revoked and Repealed these *Paragraphs*,  
and

and declared, by Act of Parliament that, whereas they had formerly so confined this *Declaration*, they now *Enlarge the contrary*, or something like this? I am sure nothing less than this can excuse me from not confining it after the manner, in which I am commanded to do so expressly in those *Paragraphs*. But nothing like this is here pretended. For taking the whole Account as you relate it (the truth of which I have heard much contested) all that appears from it is this, that a Majority of the House of Lords thought the very Form of *Declaration* capable of this Sense; and that a Majority of the House of Commons did not think fit to agree to the putting in any such Clause as that sent them by the *Lords*. But it doth not appear whether they refused this *Clause*, because they thought the *Declaration* never was designed to be so confined; or because they thought it sufficiently so confined in the *Act* it self. But neither is the Opinion of the Majority of the House of Lords, nor of the House of Commons an *Act of Parliament*; nor can it be the Duty of any Man to attend to such *private Story* as this, more than to the

press words of the Act it self. Nay, even upon Supposition that a Majority of the House of Commons thought the Declaration incapable of our Sense, (which yet doth not at all appear) *this* cannot be a better Argument *against* this Sense, than the Opinion of the Majority of the House of Lords is for it. But I wonder how you can infer from this obscure Story, either that the Commons thought the *Declaration* incapable of this Sense; or, supposing this, that they drew over the *Lords* to think so: When it is so evident that the *Commons* often refuse *Amendments*, the Matter of which they believe to be true, and might refuse this, only because they thought it unnecessary; and that the *Lords* often drop *Amendments*, without acknowledging the Ground of them to be false, and might drop this, because they were brought over to think it unnecessary. But supposing all that you would have, that both *Lords* and *Commons* did, in fact, declare by their passing the Bill mentioned without this Amendment, that it was not sufficient to rake the Declaration in that Sense, I say that this doth without an express *Clause* in the

C

Act



*Act* it self, Revoke and Repeal the plain words of another *Act*: Nor can this Obscure and Negative Argument disoblige any from Obedience to the positive and expers Law of the *Kingdom*. Nor can this *Account* of the *Proceedings* of *Parliament* prove that, their expers words the Year before are not to be regarded; or that they did not *confine* this *Declaration* to the *use* only, when they themselves tell us, not *in effect*, but in so many words, they did. I cannot but think it of ill Consequence, when there are such expers words to guide us, to hunt after private Stories, which no body is obliged so much as to know; and to argue against a Sense given by the Law itself, from such *Accounts* as but few are capable of judging whether they be true or false. For my part, I cannot but think it my Duty to regard the *Act* it self, and if I do that, I cannot give my *Assent* and *Consent* to any thing but the *use* of the *Common-Prayer-Book*; and can easily satisfy my *Conscience* without searching the *Journal* of the *House of Lords*. And all this being considered, *p. l. p. 38.* Instances of Dr. Bates and others are much to the purpose, that an Argument

*fortiori*, may still be taken from them. How far I have acted upon a different Sense from that of the *Legislators*, or persuaded others to do so, appears from the two Paragraphs I have transcribed from the *Act* it self, which you disregard wholly, for the sake of a *private Stagnation*, and yet pretend to follow the Sense of the *Legislators* who made this *Act*.

Your *Third Argument* is this, that there is that in the *Act* of Uniformity it self that plainly confronts the Sense given by me. I answer, that I have given no Sense of this *Declaration*, but what the *Act* it self commands me to give. I have transcribed the words. The *Act* says expressly in the two principal Paragraphs in it, that we must declare our Assent and Consent (both) to the use of the Common-Prayer-Book. And this is all that I say; not so much as pretending to bring an *Interpretation* of what needs done; and what is so plain that it cannot be capable of two Senses. Now, therefore, what must we do, supposing, in the Case of *Lecturers*, in some of the following Paragraphs, the *Act* requires, that they should declare their Assent and Consent unto, and Approbation of, the

## A Defence of the

Book of *Common-prayer*? Shall we interpret two *principal Paragraphs* of the *Act*, and those such as are incapable of your Sense, and such as concern the most considerable Persons in the Church, by other less important *Paragraphs*, more obscurely expressed, in words of a less determinate Signification, merely because your Sense is the hardest? I do not think that *Lecturers* were designed to be more hardly put to it, as you express it, than others; but I think, that, however the difference of Expression came in, what is said of them ought to be interpreted by the most *principal Paragraphs* in the *Act*, rather than the *principal Paragraphs* by others. And be it so, that something besides *Assent* and *Consent* to the use is required of *Lecturers*, can you give any tolerable Reason why this *Assent* and *Consent* should be so expressly confined to the *only*, in the principal, and most important *Paragraphs* of the whole *Act*? Can if something farther be required of *Lecturers*, then *Lecturers* only must regulate it; for, as for others, it is impossible that should interpret what the *Act* requires of them, by what you suppose it to require of *Lecturers*; it being expressly

quired of every Person put into any Ecclesiastical Benefice, or promotion, to declare his *unassigned Assent and Consent*, (both) to the *use of the Book of Common-prayer*. And, last of all, supposing the *Act* had expressly contradicted it self; if it had not been after such a manner, as expressly to Repeal what had gone before, it is impossible almost for you to suppose words, which would more plainly signify the Sense you contend for, than the words I have now produced, signify, that we are to confine both *Assent* and *Consent* to the *use of the Book*. And what must we do, supposing such a *Contradiction*; supposing that in the principal *Paragraph* we should be commanded to give *Assent and Consent* to the *use*, and in another, less Principal, to give *Consent* to the *use*, and *Assent* to something else? I should think that any sincere Person may satisfy his *Conscience*, tho' he should chuse the *softest Interpretation*; nay, tho' he should endeavour to persuade others to do so too. But this is far from being the *Case*.

As to your *Fourth Observation*, it is only this, that a Person who gives his



## A Defence of the

*Assent and Consent* to the use of this Book, must be satisfied of the Truth and *Warrantableness*, of what is prescribed in it: And I know no Person who contradicts this.

Thus have I examined your *Objection* against my Sense of the *Declaration*, i. e. the Sense which the *Act* it self puts upon it, in the *Paragraph* immediately going before it. But since you desire farther that the words in which this famous *Declaration runs, may be considered*, I will follow you, to see if you can offer any thing against the *Lawfulness* of it.

1. You observe, *it must be an unfeigned Assent and Consent*; and, not content with observing this, you give us a pretty Story in the Margin of a certain Dissenting Minister, which I will not repeat, but must be so free as to let you know, that I wonder how you can answer to your *Conscience*, the bringing in ludicrous and bantering piece of Wit (if I may be pardoned for calling that which hath neither *Sense* nor good Manners in it) into so serious a *Controversy* and to inform you, that I cannot think it for the Credit, either of the Person who was so facetious, or of your Cause.

to vent what tends only to very bad Consequences. But who could think, that when we are required to give *Assent*, it should be thought a difficulty that it should be a *sincere* and *unfeigned* one? Tho' I know not why I should wonder at this, when I remember you represent it as a difficulty that the *Subscription* was required to be *ex animo*, i.e. *unfeigned*. This word *unfeigned* seems to you to have a *Retrospection* to former Times, and to be inserted against the *old Puritans* who complied heretofore: And it also proves, according to you, that this *Declaration* respects not the *use* only, because the guard of such a word would not then have been needful. Now, what Fence can there possibly be against such *Comments*, and such strange *Suppositions* as this? Doth this look as if you were willing to put any Interpretation, that you think tolerable, upon the *Terms of Conformity*? However, your *Predecessors* are obliged to you, for leading People to think that they were not heretofore hearty and sincere, when they made solemn promises or Compliance. For if they were, then the word *unfeigned* cannot regard them.

Nor indeed can it possibly be a difficulty to any Person who could declare his *Assent* and *Consent* without this word unless there be any who could formally declare them, without Sincerity, or an intention of regarding such Declaration: And if there be any such no *Form* of words can hold them. But what you can mean, when you say that the *guard* of this word would not have been needful, had the *use* only been here intended, I am utterly at a loss to know; unless you would have People believe that it is nonsense to make an *unfeigned* Promise to *use* this Book. For the word *unfeigned* is joyned to *Assent* and *Consent*: And the meaning of the *Declaration* is plainly this, I do hereby declare my sincere or *unfeigned* Resolution to use this Book. But let us see, how you argue in this place. You your self join the word *unfeigned* to *Consent*, as well as *Assent*. If, therefore, it may be joyned to *Consent*, which you say regards the *use*; then *Assent* also may regard the *use*, tho' *unfeigned* be joyned to it. You your self say the *Subscription* was an *Engagement to use* the *Common prayer-book*; and yet this *Subscription*

you observed heretofore) was required to be made *ex animo*, i. e. *unfeignedly*; notwithstanding that *the Practice of the* Subscribers *would have betrayed them, if they had not kept their word.* If therefore *unfeignedly* may be joined to the word *subscribe*, when that refers to the *use*; *unfeigned* may also be joined to Assent and Consent, when they refer to the *use*. And why then may we not declare our *unfeigned* or *sincere* Resolution, to *use* the *Common-prayer-book*, notwithstanding that *our Practice will betray us*? If we were to make only a promise, would not this bind us? Is not a Promise always understood to be a *sincere* Promise? And is it a Crime, or a Blunder, to annex that word to it? This Argument will prove that no Declaration is required of us concerning the *use* of the Liturgy; because there needs only an Injunction of Authority, and our Practice will betray us if we neglect it. And so the *Subscription*, the Declaration of Consent, and of Conformity to the Liturgy, must necessarily be interpreted of something else. But it is an amazing thing to find it here insinuated, as if it were absurd for our *Legislators* to oblige

Mr.



## A Defence of the

*Ministers* to declare their *sincere* Resolution of *complying* with a *Liturgy*, in a *Act*, the design of which is only *Uniformity* in *Publick Worship*: And I am sorry to find that you can think it worth your while to invent such Observations as this.

2. You observe, *There must be both Assent and a Consent*. Now the only Point here is, whether both these words may not fairly be applied to one thing, the *use* only of the *Liturgy*; not what the signification of these words is, which cannot be determined without knowing what they relate to. What I affirm here is, that they are *both* in this *Act*, several times, applied to one thing, and particularly to the *use* of this *Liturgy*. Two Paragraphs I have produced already, in which they are *both* expressly confined to the *use* of the *Common-prayer-book*; and these the two most material Paragraphs in the *Act*. In this *first Act*, in the Paragraph which you allude to about the *Case of Lecturers*, the words *Assent* (about which only we dispute) is by it self applied to the *use* of all things prescribed in this *Book*. And in the Paragraph before that, *Assent* and *Consent* be

both, are first applied to the Book it self, and then to the *use* of it. All which plainly shews, both that they may fairly be applied to *one* and the same thing, and that they are both applied to the *use* of this Book, in this *Act* it self. Can there need any thing more to satisfy you in this Point? What if *Assent* and *Consent* differ ordinarily in their significations? This will not prove that they may not be applied both to one *thing*, or, that they ought not to be so, when the *Act* it self hath so applied them. I must observe here, that you wholly neglect what I have before offered, concerning the Custom, in *Forms of Law*, of applying two or more words, which have some difference in their signification, to one and the same thing. And I am sure I may say, that it is much more probable, at least, from the numberless Instances of this nature, that these two words were designed to be applied to one thing, than it can be that they were designed for two: For I believe you would find it hard to produce any Instances, where two words, thus joined together in a *Form of Law*, are applied to two differing things.

3. You

## A Defence of the

3. You observe that this *Assent and Consent must be to all, and every thing*, i. e. to the use of every thing in the *Common prayer-book*; as I have already sufficiently proved. And in this I am no farther concerned. And now from the whole let the Reader judge, whether I had no reason to say what I did on this Head. But I wonder you still go on to propagate unreasonable *Hyperboles*; such as you will not say plainly you can defend or approve of, in a *Book* in which you undertake to give us the *Stable Principles of Nonconformity*; without putting an plain mark of dislike upon them, warning your *Readers* sufficiently gainst them. Are you obliged in an *Abridgment* of the Reasonings of the *Rejected Ministers* to give us every thing they say, or the most unreasonable part of it? If not, why should it stand in your *Book*, that *words could scarce be devised by the Wit of Man more full and significant*, &c. Or, why should you not plainly profess your self against such Aggravations? But if you look into my *Book* again, you will find that you had no reason to find fault with me for calling this *your Comment*: For you

will see, that it is a mistake of your own, and that I speak not to you, but to the *Ejected* and *Dissenting Ministers*, and mean a *Comment* made by one of them; and that when I speak of you particularly, I speak most commonly in the third Person.

I did blame you indeed very severely for your quoting those ridiculous Passages out of Dr. Swadlin, a poor neglected Author; and for drawing an Argument from his Frenzy against *Assent and Consent*, to the *Common-prayer-book*; because such Stories, so brought in, are *nothing to the Cause*, and *intend to vilify and ridicule the Common-prayer-book*, and to set us at an irreconcilable distance from one another, and the like. And is it not indeed an inexcusable Fault in one, who frequently alleges in his own defence, that he was only an *Abridger* of the Sense of the *Ejected Ministers*, himself to draw in such a ridiculous *Quotation* out of a distracted Author; to Comment upon it; to argue against the Approbation of the *Common-prayer book* from it; and to talk as if the poor *Nonconformists* had been ejected for *not having the Spirit to discern the Divine In-*



## A Defence of the

*Inspiration of the Common-prayer-book!* Whoever looks into my Book will find that this was what I blamed in you. And now, without either defending, or retracting, this so unjust and unbecoming a Behaviour, the same Passages are Reprinted again without any token of dislike upon them. However, two things I find said in vindication of your self. *First*, If the *Quotation* be ridiculous, *why was not the Author censured, and his Book suppressed?* As if every extravagant distracted Man's Writings were worth the looking after; or, as if, because the *Author* was not censured, and his *Book* suppressed, therefore it were becoming or pardonable in you to draw in these *Passages* in an *Abridgment* of other Men's Writings; in an *Argument* against *As sent and Consent*; and to plead from them against approving a *Book*, in which there is no such thing to be found. Secondly, You allege, that if *extravagant Flights on all sides were more freely exposed* it would sooner bring Men of Temper together, than set them more asunder. Now who would not think from hence, that the only thing I blamed in you, was the Ridiculing these Passages out of Doors.

Sna

*Sadlin*; whereas whoever looks into  
 my *Book*, will see that I say the same  
 thing in other words; nay, that I ad-  
 vise you, to ridicule and *expose* them as  
 much as you *please* in their proper Time  
 and Place; and that I blame you not  
 for that (any other wise than as it is ve-  
 ry inopportune introduced) but for  
 what is utterly indefensible, your argu-  
 ing from such *poor Writers* against *As-*  
*sent* and *Consent* to the *Common-prayer-*  
*book*, and the like, as mentioned above.  
 And therefore, you did wisely to mi-  
 stake the Point, and overlook all that I  
 said upon that Head. But surely *Retra-*  
*ction* should not be so difficult a Pra-  
 ctice to a *Christian* and a *Divine*; and  
 if you now understand my meaning,  
 you cannot avoid it. Tho' as for the  
 last Apology you make, *You*, of all Men  
 living, have no Title to it, how frequent  
 occasion soever you have for it. For you  
 cannot but remember how you have  
 joined in severely *reprehending* a Person,  
 who hath little deserved it at your  
 hands, for endeavouring to expose some  
*Errandancies* on your side (tho' it was  
 his professed design to do so) not because  
 Men of *Temper* and Religion would be

set

## A Defence of the

*set more asunder by such Methods; because the Irreligious and Prophane might be induced by them to deride serious Religion and the Worship of God. You are therefore now obliged, either to retract this publicly, or to acknowledge it to be a bar against your own making use of this Plea. You go on after this, and cite two more Authors who magnifie the Common-prayer-book more than you think it deserves: The one indeed, a Person excellent for Learning and Piety; the other I know nothing of, but from the Sentences you have here quoted, which I think so much akin to the Passages out of Dr. Swaddish that you might well have spared them. But what can this, and an hundred more such Instances signifie, to the Declaration of Assent and Consent, about which only we are concerned? As supposing you cannot have such an Opinion of the Excellency of the Common-prayer-book, as to think that the Compiler of it had the extraordinary Aid and Assistance of God; yet, methinks you might leave to others the liberty of ascribing what they esteem excellently good, to the great Fountain of all Goodness, since*

they require not *you* to think or say so: at least, you should forbear to argue from hence against approving it, and conforming to the *use* of it. Should I argue against esteeming or valuing the *Elected Ministers*, because it is your opinion that *they were acted by the Divine Abridg. p.* spirit in the Cause they espoused; would you not easily see the Fallacy? And this was what I censured in *you*; the making the private Opinion of some particular Persons, an Argument against the Declaration of Assent and Consent, which includes not in it any thing of the same nature. But the *Defence* of this you wholly avoid.

Upon the whole Matter, I cannot see that I have any reason to recede from that Principle of this Declaration of Assent and Consent, for which I contended; or to be ashamed of having been *positive* in this Matter, as you express it. But whether you have not given me a just reason to put you in mind under even the head, of sparing your Censures upon *Conforming Clergy*, I must leave to you to judge, who have ever read your Chapter, and your *Defence* of it, and



## A Defence of the

and what I have heretofore remarked  
this nature out of *them*.

Se<sup>ct</sup>. 3. Of the *Objection* against the  
*Declaration* and *Subscription* taken from  
the *Office* of *Baptism*, &c.

**A**S to the *Rubrick*, at the *end* of the  
*Office* of *Baptism*, scrupled by  
and your Brethren, I endeavoured  
shew that it might fairly be understood  
only of such *Children* as are *duly* Baptized  
upon Supposition only that the *De-  
claration* and *Subscription* extended, to  
*Proposition*, which I deny that they  
I observed that you could not prove  
words incapable of this Sense; and that  
if they were fairly capable of it, there  
was no need of a *Text* of *Scripture*  
to prove the Salvation of such *Infants*.  
The Reply I have to this, is in the words  
of Mr. *Baxter*. And all that I can  
learn from them, is, that Bishop  
*derfon*, and Bishop *Gunning* did think  
that the *Children* of *Heathens* had a  
right to *Baptism*, provided they had  
*sors*. But how this proves that the  
*brick* can be interpreted of any but  
*Infants* as are *duly* Baptized, I see

Some Persons extended the Rubrick to the Children of Heathens; it was, according to this very account, because they were of opinion, that *such* had a title to *Baptism*: not because they thought that any Infants were saved, but such as were *duly Baptized*. The *Objection* taken from this opinion of Dr. *Sanderſon's* would be the ſame againſt the truth of the Rubrick (about which only we are now concerned) were it expreſſed plainly, of *Infants duly Baptized*. It may be a very true *Propoſition*, that all *Regenerate* perſons are ſaved: And yet the ſeveral perſons who ſubſcribe this may have very different notions about *Regeneration*, and the perſons who are truly *Regenerate*. And I think it far from being evident, that I am obliged to underſtand by *Children Baptized*, *All Children Baptized*; or *All Children Baptized by any Miniſter*, according to this Office, becauſe Biſhop Gunning perhaps thought all ſuch *duly Baptized*. *All Children Baptized* cannot neceſſarily be underſtood here: For Biſhop Gunning himſelf, and Biſhop *Sanderſon*, ſpoke only of ſuch as are *Baptized with Sponsors*; And yet your *ſuppoſed* *Cases* under

der this head, extend to *all*, as I observed before, tho you take no notice of it. Nor can I be obliged to understand it of every individual Infant Baptized according to this Form: For Bishop Sanderſon, &c. cannot be ſuppoſed to ſpeak of any ſuch Infants but what have Sponſors ſeriously undertaking for them; nay it is plain they included *ſuch* in this Rubrick, not becauſe they thought it reached to all but ſuch as are *duly Baptized*, but on becauſe they thought *ſuch* to be *duly Baptized*. But, ſuppoſing that Biſhop Gunning did mean by this Rubrick, that all Infants materially Baptized, are certainly ſaved by their being Baptized (which is incredible) yet there are many, beſides *Him*, that joyned in Impoſition of this Rubrick, that we to have ſome regard to *them* alſo: And it would be too great and fruitleſs a ſearch out what was intended in Rubrick by a majority of *them*. So I gave two Answers to your Objections taken from this Rubrick. *Fiſt*, that Declaration and Subſcription, reached not: *Secondly*, that, ſuppoſing they it might fairly be underſtood only of Children *duly Baptized*; as we find Biſhop

Reasonableness of Conformity.

37

Bishop Sanderson, and Gunning themselves understood it only of such as were, in their opinions, *duly Baptized*. Nor do I see that any thing is advanced against this. And to this I added, that there was no need of a *Text of Scripture* to prove to you, that *Children duly Baptized, are saved*. But what You here call a *piece of Wit* (a word which you seem very fond of, when you have little else to say) is as serious, and as far removed from what you fix upon it, as any Sentence that you can possibly name. You cited, in the name of the *Ejected Ministers*, the *second Commandment, as an Argument* that we had not a *positive certainty, as to all* that were *Baptized, and taken out of the World in their Infancy, that they were, according to God's Salvation*. This is our own account of the purpose for which you cited it. But you are very angry with me for saying that this *Text* is produced by you, to prove the damnation of some Infants received by our Church. The words are those in which God declares, that He *punishes the iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth Generation*. And these words be not intended by you,

D 3

to



## A Defence of the

to refer to the condition of *Infants* in the other World, they are nothing to our present purpose. For I could not possibly suppose you to argue thus, *Almighty God punished the Children often with some Temporal punishments for the sake of their Fathers wickedness*; therefore, *We cannot be certain that God will not punish Infants with the loss of Eternal happiness, for their Father's wickedness*. I say, if your argument from this *Text* be thus framed, nothing can be farther from concluding and even then, I may very well say, that you produce it to make it probable, that God will punish *Infants* in the other World for their *Father's Crimes*. But it is plain from your own representation, now Reprinted, that this *Clause* of the *Second Commandment* was produced in order to make it appear, as probable, that God would punish *Infants* (in the Eternal concerns) for the sins of the Fathers, as any other *Text* of Scripture could make their *Salvation* appear to be. And consequently, was produced by you as a probable argument for their *Damnation*. You produce it, by your own confession, to prove that we cannot be certain of the *Salvation* of the *Infants* wicked

wicked Parents. And how can you suppose it to prove this, unless you suppose that it makes it probable that God will punish them in the other World, for their Father's Wickedness? And this Punishment in the other World is, in other words, their *Damnation*. Your words were these that follow, *Now how could they (the Ejected Ministers) pretend to be sure by the word of God, that all such Infants went to Heaven, when God so positively declared in the second Commandment, that He would punish, &c?* This Text is here produced by you, as an *Argument* by itself, that God will not make eternally happy the Infants of wicked Parents. And tho you attempt to soften the matter now, yet this was visibly the meaning you had fixed upon it: which makes me wonder that you should now endeavour to alter your Argument taken from it; after such a manner as to make your application of this Text to this purpose, appear to be without the least ground. Your *Argument* from the second Commandment, you have now thought fit to defend thus, *For if God in some cases was so displeased with Posterity, for the sins of Progenitors, as not to* admit

## A Defence of the

admit them into the Congregation of his People for some Generations (as in the case of *Bastardy*, Deut. 23. 2.) How doth it appear, that the Application of the outward seal of the Covenant, would certainly be entitled to the *Spiritual Blessings* of it? answer. 1. It doth not follow that, because God forbade a *Bastard* and his Posterity, to enter into the Congregation, therefore we cannot be certain that They shall not suffer in their spiritual and eternal concerns for the fault of others. The certainty of that may appear from other Texts, and other considerations, notwithstanding this; for as much as the eternal happiness doth not appear to be in the least, affected by that prohibition upon them, and the cause of it which was wholly involuntary in themselves. If they had a title to the *outward Seal* (which they might have had notwithstanding this prohibition) then we may be certain, notwithstanding this, that they had a title to the *Spiritual Blessings* of it also. And, by the way, we may observe that how much so ever the *Posterity of wicked Jews* were threatened with Punishment, yet their *Infants* were never supposed to be out of the Covenant.

or to have lost their *Right* to the Seal of

it. 2. It may be certain that they were entitled to the spiritual Blessings of Circumcision, because they were not prohibited from that Rite; notwithstanding that they were prohibited from coming into the Congregation; which hath nothing to do with *Spiritual* and *Eternal* Blessings. 3. The *Case* you instance in now, can never shew, that the second Commandment proves any thing against the certainty of the Salvation of the *Baptized Infants* of *wicked Parents*, which was the point now before you.

4 This *Case* doth not appear to touch our present purpose: for the prohibition doth not seem to be merely on the account of the Fathers wickedness; but rather on some other account, as in the other *Cases* which it follows. And therefore you may as well argue from that *Chapter* against our being certain that *Persons*, who had any accidental imperfections in their Bodies, had a title to the *Spiritual Blessings* of *God's Covenant*, as against such a title in the *Children of wicked Progenitors*. I see not, therefore, how any thing here proves, either that you did not produce the 2d. Commandment, for what I said



## A Defence of the

said, you did; or that there is any thing in *that* to incline us to think, that *Infants* may suffer in their eternal concerns for the sake of the Wickedness of their *Parents*. What follows is only true, upon Supposition that the Infants Baptized have not a title to *Baptism*: And I have before given my *Reasons*, why I think the *Rubrick* cannot be extended to such.

The *Cases* supposed by *You*, in order to shew the absurdity of this *Rubrick*, did indeed surprize me: And that surprize still remains, notwithstanding your endeavour towards the *Abatement* of it. Doth it follow that the *Children* of *Christian Parents*, when Baptized, are not Saved after Death, because then it would be in the power of any person to send them to Heaven, by killing them? Doth it follow that the Primitive *Martyrs* did not go to Heaven, upon their dissolution, because then it would be in some sense, in the power of *Persecutors* to send men to that blessed Place? But certainly, as their title to Heaven is founded upon the terms laid down by Almighty God; and not given them by their Persecutors: so it may be in the  
Case

Case of Children. Their title to Heaven is founded upon God's Will: And the Tyrant that kills them is only an instrument of putting an end to their abode here, as any Distemper is. And yet surely it would be very improper to say, that a *Fever* hath a power of procuring eternal Happiness; or to deny that a Child killed by a *Fever* is certainly Saved, because this would be giving to that Disease a power of Salvation. A good *Christian* (as I before put the Case) by bringing his Child to Baptism, secures it's Salvation, provided it dye before actual Sin. This, surely, you cannot deny, if you hold that any *Infants* have a title to *Baptism*, or any *Benefit* from it. A good *Christian*, therefore, according to your way of arguing, hath the power of Salvation in his hands; which it is absurd to think: And consequently, such *Children* dying, are not saved, because this is giving *to mortals* *power of Souls*. Now, if this argument will not hold here; if, notwithstanding, *Children Baptized may be Saved*; then it is also evident, that the *Children* in our supposed Cases may be also Saved, notwithstanding it be so far in the power of

of men to procure them Salvation, as to be instruments of sending them to that Happiness procured for them by *Jesus Christ*. And in this sense, All Parents have Salvation in their power, as they are instrumental in bringing their Children into being; and in putting them into a method of obtaining Happiness. Be pleased to observe, that your Argument taken from these *Cases*, is not founded upon any antecedent proof, from the Will of God, that the *Infants* you suppose, have no title to *Baptism*, or *Heaven*; but only upon some absurdities consequent upon the contrary Doctrine. To this I answer, that it cannot destroy their title to *Baptism* and *Heaven*, to say, that upon supposition of such a *title*, it will be in the power of Men to procure Salvation for *Infants*, by killing them as soon as they are *Baptized*: because you acknowledge I think, that some *Children* have a certain title to *Baptism*, and *Heaven*; and yet the same *absurdities* will follow upon supposition of their title. And a strong a proof may be drawn from them, against the title of *any Children* as against the title of *all Children*. I do  
no

not say, that all Children have such a title: but I say, that their want of it cannot be proved from such *absurdities*. I call them *absurdities*, according to your *supposition* only; for, in truth, it is no absurdity to give *such a power to Mortals*, as is included in these Cases; that is, to maintain, that men may be the *instruments* of sending *Infants* to Heaven; notwithstanding which, their *Title* to Heaven, may be founded entirely upon God himself; his Will; and his *Terms*. You cannot say it is impossible, in the nature of things, that God should promise Salvation to innocent Children, for the sake of his Son, and upon their being Baptized: And yet these *Suppositions* will as well prove the Impossibility of this, as what they are brought for. The Rubrick we are concerned about, is far from saying, that *All Children have a right to Baptism*; but it says, that *All Children Baptized, Dying before actual Sin, are Saved*: And this Bishop Gunning himself never understood of any but such as had a title to *Baptism*, though he might differ from others about the *Subjects* of *Baptism*. And, therefore, I see not what it signifies for you to alledge

Dr,



## A Defence of the

Dr. Comber's opinion, that *All Children are alike*; &c. When my wonder was not, that You should deny that (for may deny it my self, notwithstanding this *Rubrick*;) but that such distant and strange *Suppositions* should be brought in, which prove nothing against the Right in all Children; and are much less proper to be brought against an Office framed for a *Christian Country*, and the *Children of Christian Parents*. Dr. Comber, as far as I see, might be otherwise interpreted than He is by you. But I am not concerned, as I know of, much as to know his opinion about the Subjects of Baptism: And think it very hard that any person's private opinion should be made the Standard of mind or the Rule for my interpreting *Public Declarations*. I cannot therefore but say again, and that with great concern; that such *unaccountable Suppositions* as these, have contributed very much to the hardness some against all thoughts of *Agreement*. That there is a true *Regeneration* in such *Infants*, as have a *Title to Baptism* (and such only I spoke) is what I endeavour'd next to clear: And if I differ from you about the *Subjects of Baptism*, you

have there my Reasons for it. But finding nothing here against what I alleged, but only that I am referr'd to an *Exposition*, which contradicts me not in the least, I have no occasion given me for adding any more words upon this head: Only to vindicate my reasoning against your Argument against this Doctrine of *Regeneration at Baptism*, taken from the evil consequences it may have in contributing to the hardning of Men in Sin. Your Argument was this, *We cannot concur in thanking God for being Regenerated the Infant, for fear of contributing to the hardening of careless Men in the opinion, that they need no more after Baptism.* I answered that the same Objection would lie against many Expressions in *St Paul*, (nay the Doctrine of Justification it self) from which many did actually take occasion to contrive in Sin: And yet these expressions were good, and fit to be used, and great Arguments to care and diligence in Christians. And I added, that it is rather an Argument for the greatest Care, that we are admitted by *Baptism* to glorious privileges, and are made the Temples of God, than to the contrary. And

per-

certainly there need not many words to prove, that it is not a sufficient Object on against the use of any Expression that wicked Men may abuse it to carry forward their evil purposes, which they are resolved upon without the help of such expressions. But, besides all this, do not you Your self grant, that many are *Regenerate by Baptism*; and will you not say this, for fear they should make an ill use of this, and fall away?

You will, notwithstanding this; that this *Objection* alone is of no force against the *Expression* in our *Office*. Do not you here own, that *it is a persuasive Argument to a good Life*, to let Men know the Privileges their *Baptism* entitles them to, provided they live according to that Religion they profess? And doth not our *Office*, throughout the whole, suppose, and press, the necessity of this? Doth it not suppose that the may fall, notwithstanding this *Regeneration*? Are not the Prayers in it, designed to create in all who are concerned the greatest *Care*, and *Diligence*; and all the circumstances of it visibly frame to this end? What ground, therefore, for this *Objection* here, where the necessity

ity of a constant Holiness in our future Lives, is supposed and inculcated? And how you can say, if you ever read the Office, that *all promiscuously, because Baptized, are assured of the Blessings of Baptism*; or that there is any thing in it, which affirms, or implies, that a Real Regeneration is needless in a Baptized Person; I must leave to your own Conscience: being unwilling to say, what such a Representation justly deserves; contrary, not only to Candor, and Equity, but to express passages in the Office itself. I shall only add, that We are not here disputing, what difficulties a Minister may come under, by following his own judgment in *Extraordinary Cases*; but what obligations He brings himself under by *Declaration of Assent, and Consent, and Subscription: and so I dismiss this head.*

Art. 4. *Of the Objection against Assent and Consent; and Subscription; taken from the Use of Godfathers, &c.*

Godfathers were represented by You, in the name of the Ejected Ministers, as justifying out the Parents right to devote

E



## A Defence of the

*devote their Children to God, and the Use of them as opening a wide Door to the profaning one of the most awful Solemnities of Religion; and the like. To this I answered, to this effect: That the Parents themselves are to provide these Sponsors; that by providing these Sponsors in order to Dedicate their Children to God, They make the Dedication of their Children, their own Act; that the care in chusing Godfathers, will be proportionable to the concern of Parents for their Children, &c. Your Reply to what I urged, I shall now examine.*

p. 161.

*First, You deny, that The Parents do properly, in this way, devote their Children to God by Baptism. But I wonder very much at your denying so plain a matter as this seems to be. For when a Parent provides all things that are required in order to the Dedication of his Child to God, and knows that it is in order to this Dedication that He doth this; there any need of an Argument to prove that He himself properly Dedicates his Child to God? And is not the Administration of *Baptism*, to his Child, be ultimately resolved into the Parents Resolution, that the Child shall be*

vol

voted to Almighty God? But again, You deny that this *Dedication* is as much p. 162. their own *Act* and *Deed*, as if the Children had no *Sponsors*. *i. e.* You deny, that their providing *Sponsors*, in order to devote their Children, is a sufficient proof of their desire, and resolution so to devote them. And your Reason for this is, that if they had no *Sponsors*, & solemn *explicit* *Covenanting* would be required of their Parents, &c. To the like purpose, in the next page. By which reply, any one would imagine that I had said, that their providing *Sponsors*, was as much a *solemn Explicit Covenanting* for their Children, in their own persons; as if they did *explicitly* *covenant*, themselves: when all that I said, was this, that their devoting their Children to God, was their own *Act*, tho' done by providing *Sponsors* to devote them, as fully, and properly, as if they did it without *Sponsors*. And the truth of this plain from hence, that a person may truly devote his Child to God, without an *explicit* *Covenanting* for it, his own person; only by providing all things required in order to it's *perfection*. And, as for what You add, that

that many provide Sponsors, who know nothing of the *Covenanting* part, and as a mere piece of Ceremony; You may have full as much Liberty of making Christian's sensible of their Duty in this Point in the *Established Church*, as in a *Separation* from it. That I confess, I see not, how *You*, upon your new Set of *Principles*, can impose upon *Christians*, at this Solemnity, *Solemn explicit Covenanting in the name of their Children*; or refuse Baptism to the Child of a *Professed Christian*, for the want of it. And if you may lawfully Baptize *Children* without this, then it will be no sufficient Objection gainst complying with our Office, that this *explicit Covenanting* is not the required. Nay, if it were; the *Ordinance* might easily come to be as much profaned, as it is now: if this be profanation of it, that many *Parents* have not a due Sense of their part in it. For I see not, but that they may, our present circumstances, be made sensible of *that*; and that they may have as little Sense of it, as *God's* are said to have now, were the will to be transacted by themselves.

who would charge the Ignorance or Carelessness of *Parents*, upon the *Office* itself, which is as solemn as possible; and tends not, in the least, to such *Ignorance* or *Carelessness*: Besides that such *Stupidity* in *Parents* may as well be cured, in *our* way, as in *yours*. Nay, I fear, You may come, after this manner, to charge the carelessness of Men, upon many *Texts* in the *Scripture* it self: And particularly, to charge the Institution and *Precedents* of *Baptism*, found in the *New Testament*, as not including in them explicit Vows and Cautions, sufficient to prevent mistakes, and carelessness, in so solemn a matter. Again, What you cannot understand in this answer, is this, that any Person can have Right, one while to personate Me the Father, as *Dedicating my Child to God*; and another while, to represent my Child, believing, and engaging a sincere Obedience. I answer, that as there is no natural Right, or positive Law pretended for this; so none ought to be required: because the willingness of any Person to do this, is sufficient, with the Parent's consent, which is always supposed. If any Person be willing, and receive



*A Defence of the*

power from the *Father* (who can give it) to Personate *Him*, and to Personate his *Child*, (which is your own account of the Office of Godfathers) then surely, That Person hath a sufficient Right to do it. Once more, *It is not clear* to you, that the *Faith* of the *Parent* is in all ordinary Cases, the ground of the Administration of Baptism to the Child, according to the Church: That You have no reason to allege, but that you cannot reconcile this, with *the Canon that says*, no Parent shall be admitted to answer as Godfather for his own Child. As if you should argue, The Church requires *Parents* to provide *Sponsors* for their Children, distinct from themselves; (which very thing supposes the *Parents* to be *Christians*; therefore it is not clear, that the *Faith* of the *Parents* is the ground of the *Baptism* of their Children. But I find not any shadow of a *Consequence* in the Argument. Lastly, You say, that *where an Institution purely Humane, is ordinarily so managed as to interfere with what is really Divine*, You ought not to comply with it. This I suppose, you must mean by the *Obligation* you speak of, *decide*

declare your *Self* against it; because if you mean any thing less than this, it can be no Reason against your *Ministerial* Conformity. But now, if there be no necessity to your self, of *managing it so, as to interfere with anything really Divine*; I think, you may safely comply with it: For you may declare, as much as you please, against the mismanagement of others, without refusing compliance for the sake of what you have no concern in. If *others* should accept of *Atheists*, or *Deists*, or *Jews*, or *Mahometans*; I see not what this is to *You*, who may conform as a *Minister*, without bringing your self under any Obligation to admit of any *Godfathers*, but serious Professors of *Christianity*. I am sure the *Declaration*, and *Subscription*, which we are now considering, rather brings us under a sacred Obligation to admit none but such, than the contrary. And a *Minister* that acts by this Rule, may answer it in the Court of his own Conscience, and of his great Master; and I believe, I may say, in the Courts of this World also. But, if it should not be so; I cannot understand, that the possible inconveniences that

## A Defence of the

that may attend a Minister's doing his Duty, carry with them any Argument, why He should not undertake that Office. The Canon I referr'd you to, shews that the *Church* took some care about the admission of *Godfathers* and required all *Ministers* to do so. And supposing the neglect of this to be Universal, and connived at by all in Authority (which I very much doubt yet the Rule which I laid down about our Obligation to observe the *Canons* will not at all serve your purpose here For tho' it will follow from hence, that a *Minister* is not absolutely obliged to observe this *Canon*; yet certainly a *Minister* may observe it, if He see fit And that with more commendation than so useful a Point, than He can expect for the neglect of it. That the requiring of Sponsors tends to the profanation of this Ordinance, I cannot yet see because the carelessness of the generality of *Sponsors*, (which is the only Argument you allege) is not the least proof of it; since this doth not follow at all, from the *Church's* requiring *Sponsors*, but from the *Parents* little care which is no ways encouraged by the *Church*, and need not be countenanced

by any *Minister* in it: And therefore, tho' *guilt may be contracted by more Persons*, in this method, than if *Sponsors* were never required; yet this cannot be charged, as any ways caused by the requiring *Sponsors*: Nor can this (of itself) be a greater Argument against requiring *Sponsors*, than the carelessness of *Parents* themselves would be, against requiring *Solemn Promises* from them, on this occasion: for *more guilt might be contracted* this way, than would be, were this not required. And, indeed, in this whole matter, I find very little, but what must suppose it true, that a *Minister* in the *Established Church*, brings himself under an Obligation to admit any *Persons* for Godfathers, tho' never so unqualified; and tho' known to be *unlikely to set themselves to answer such Obligations*; before it can be esteemed any Argument against this Declaration, and Subscription, we are considering. And, as far as I know any thing of the Terms of Conformity, this *Supposition* is wholly groundless.

But you are not content to vindicate what you had advanced before, against the Use of Godfathers and Godmothers: But are pleased to add something new upon



on the *Questions*, put to them in the *Form of Baptism*. But I see nothing here sufficient to prove any Absurdity in these *Questions*: since it is evident from the *Church-Catechism*, that the *Answers* to these *Questions*, are intended only as *Promises of Faith*, and *Repentance*, made in the name of the *Infants*, by their *Sureties*; Promises of what they are bound to do, when they come to the use of their Reason. That of *desiring to be Baptized*, seems the most improper: And yet, even that, may, by a candid and equitable Person, be interpreted so, as to signify no more, than what the *Infant* ought to do, were it capable; and judged to be founded upon good Bottom, viz: that every one ought when he comes of Age, to be affected, as to profess, that himself would have desired *Baptism*, had he been capable of doing it.

In short, I am no more averse, than you, to Bishop Stillingfleet's distinction of admitting some Infants to Baptism, in the Right of their Parents, and others in the Right of the Church: or to a distinction of Offices for these two different Cases. But I think, we have reason

sons good enough, to promise, and subscribe to, the *Use* of our *Office*, as it is now: And, I hope, I have said what is sufficient to *satisfie*, even *those who are* no more *willing to be satisfied*, in this Point, than all of us ought, in reason, to be.

Sect. 5. *Of the Use of the sign of the Cross in the Office of Baptism.*

THE next thing in which I am concerned, is the *Use* of the *Sign of the Cross*. Amongst the Arguments produced by you against the *Use* of it, this was one, that you durst not use it, as prescribed in our *Liturgy*, for fear of giving the injudicious an occasion of misunderstanding, about the Power, and Virtue, of the Sign of the Cross; tho' the word *power* be not in the Office, but the Infant be said to be Signed, *in* them only, &c. Upon which I thought I had a just occasion of asking, *what* of our differences we could hope for, if such methods were taken; if, when there is no Reason against a thing, what is acknowledged to be unreasonable, shall be made an Objection against it. In which I thought not to imply, that the Dissenting

ing Ministers, did not suppose that they had any reasons against the *Use* of it, as you are willing to understand me; but that it is very unhappy, that such Arguments should be used against the lawfulness of the *Use* of any thing, as are of force, as much in *Cases* where there is no absolute reason against the thing, as in *Cases* where there is. That the *Use* of the *Cross* should be refused, for fear *Injudicious* Persons should understand words in a Sense of which they are not capable, is, I confess, to me a wonderful thing: And such an Argument as if pursued by you, must prove the unlawfulness of many of your own Practices. I did say, that it was impossible the words *in token*, (which must refer to what follows) should be meant, *in virtue and power*, (which must refer to something going before :) and I gave you afterwards my Interpretation of the words, which you have not thought worth your while to consider. But in answer to this Affirmation of mine You ask, *And doth Mr. H. really think it impossible for Persons to apprehend to be the meaning of the words?* which is such a sort of a Reply, as I have been

too much used to, to be much surprized at. Who cannot see, that there is a great deal of difference between saying, that it is *impossible, words should be meant in this Sense,* and saying, that it is *impossible for Persons to apprehend they were so meant?* For my own part, I never knew any one yet, whether Learned, or Unlearned, who did apprehend these words to be so intended, as You say, some may Interpret them. Your Quotations out of Mr. Hooker, and Dr. Comber, whatever they shew about their Opinion of the Sign of the *Cross* (and that is no more but what may be said about the word *Cross*, pronounced by the Mouth, supposing the Baptized Person were only pronounced to be a Disciple of the *Cross*;) they shew not that they ever dream't that these *Words* attributed any virtue to the *Sign* of the *Cross*; any such *virtue* as we dispute about. Besides, every Minister that uses this Office, is left at full liberty to explain any part of it: And need not Baptize any one Child, before He have endeavoured to remove such sort of groundless scruples out of the minds of his audience, if He suspect any such *Conclusions* to be among them. Tho', as far as



## A Defence of the

as I know any thing of the World, He that should go about to mention such *conceits*, might probably be the first occasion of raising them in the minds of most Men: So far do I look upon it from being probable, that the *Generalist* are apt to understand Virtue to be here attributed to the Sign of the Cross. But supposing Mr. Hooker did attribute Virtue (in your Sense) to this Sign, what the *unhappy consequences* of such a *mistake* in him, were, I know not, till you discover them. The *Connexion* between this *Argument*, and that which I took from your *Occasional Communion*, You say, is but odd: But I look upon it to be so plain, that you cared not to say any thing further about it. For if you practise one thing, notwithstanding that the Injudicious are apt to have misunderstandings about it, it cannot be an Argument against the practice of another thing, that the *Injudicious* are apt to have misunderstandings about it.

The next *Objection* was, that the Use of the Cross, looks as if Christ's Institution were esteemed a Bond not sufficient firm, and strong, &c. I answered, The Church hath declared the contrary. The more

unaccountable, You reply, that Ministers should be *Suspended* for omitting the Cross.

But certainly, if you delighted not in the remembrance of such things, and thought them not likely to move the People, where you have nothing else to say, you would not introduce this Subject so frequently, after so *unaccountable* a manner. For may not a Minister be *Suspended* for not Answering those Obligations, which He hath solemnly brought himself under; because what He omitted, is not an Essential matter? May He not be *Suspended*, for wilfully neglecting to use the *Prayers* prescribed, because they are not *Essential*? One would think, that you could not think either good Reasoning, or a proper Method of putting an end to our Differences. I observed to you, upon this head, that the addition of *Prayers*, looked as if Christ's Institution were not sufficient; and yet, I added, *You know, Baptism is sufficient without one Prayer*; by which, all must know that I meant, a *Regular, vocal Prayer* used by the Minister. And all must perceive, that my Argument was this, that if the sufficiency of Christ's Institution, considered

ed by it self, be an Argument against the *Cross*; then it may be also against the use of any *Prayers* at the Solemnity of *Baptism*. Here you acknowledge your self, that *Baptism* may be sufficient without the *Verbal uttering of a Regular Prayer*, by the *Minister*; which is all I contended for: And yet you misse your *Reader*, with a Discourse about the *Parent's Prayer* at the Dedication of his Child; and the expediency of *Prayer* at this Solemnity. As if it had equalled the Use of the *Cross*, totall Use of *Prayers*, at *Baptism*; or as if the Argument, which was wholly taken from the *Sufficiency of Christs Institution*, required me to prove, that the *Cross* was as expedient as *Prayer*. But I must desire to be excused from asserting what I am as far from holding as you self: And think it fully sufficient, have shew'n, that your Reasoning taken from *Christs Institution* holds against the use of *Prayers* (which is highly expedient) as well as against the use of the *Cross*, at this Solemnity: and therefore cannot be just. But I am concerned to find, under almost every head, my Arguments so represented

and altered by you, as often to tempt your *Readers* to think very ill of me, and to give me frequent Occasions of renewing my Complaints of you.

Another *Argument* produced by you, against your *Compliance* with the *use* of the *Cross*, is, *To witness your Dislike of the Vanity and Idolatry of the Papists.* I answered, that this, in it self, was no Argument against the *Use* of this, tho' an Humane Institution; because we use it not after their Manner, or for their Purposes. And certainly the true Reason of discarding any such thing, is, that it is abused among our selves; not that it is abused in another Country. And that it is used after an Idolatrous manner by us, I do not see that you endeavour to prove. If you know any, who do abuse this *Sign*, it cannot be from any Encouragement the Church gives them: And the Alteration of this at *Baptism*, tho' it might serve other good Purposes, could not secure those from abusing it, who abuse now; unless you shew, that their Abuse of it is founded upon our *use* of it, that Solemnity. The *Imposition* of us belongs to another Head.

F

As



As for *Kneeling* at the Communion; when I said, that I found rather a great deal in you for it, than any thing against it; had you any Inclination to understand me, you might easily have seen that I meant this only about the *Lawfulness* of the Thing it self; tho' Mr. Baxter, (whose *Abridger* you are) hath mentioned the *Decency* of it also. And I suppose, what you have added here in this last Performance upon it, may serve to excuse my saying so.

Sect. 6. Of the Objection against the Declaration and Subcription, taken from the Office of Ordination.

THE Passage scrupled by you and your Brethren, is this, in the Preface to the Ordination Office. It is evident to all Men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures, and antient Authors that from the Apostles Times, there have been these Orders in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons: To which observ'd that you, in your Representation of it, added these Words, *by Divine Appointment*; which, I still think you ought not to have done. For, in the

ing of the *Terms of Conformity*, the naked Proposition to which our *Assent* is required, ought to be set down, and every one left to judge for himself what is implied in it, or consequent upon it.

In Answer to your *Objection* taken from this Sentence, and the *Prayers* in the *Ordination-Office*, I observed, that the *Declaration of Assent and Consent*, and the *Subscription*, touched only the *Use of the Book*, and not this Sentence in the *Preface*. And for farther Satisfaction in this, I must refer the Reader to what I have again said, in Vindication of this, against your *Objections*. I observed also, that, supposing the *Subscription* to refer to such Sentences; yet this could not be affected by it, because there is nothing in it *contrary to the Word of God*: And, that the *Prayers* to be used in the *Ordination-Office* imply not anything plainly, but that *God hath appointed divers Orders of Ministers in his Church*. And to these two Observations I find no Reply, that so much as shews, that you your self think otherwise.

In the next Place I observed, upon Supposition, that *Assent*, and *Consent*,  
F 2 do

do refer to this *Sentence*, that the Intent of it is only to express, that We ourselves think it an evident Truth. And this I observed, because I found a great Strefs laid upon the Dissent of some Great Men, and *Diligent Readers*; and the Sentence interpreted, as if the Design of it had been to say, that no *Diligent Readers* could possibly doubt of the Truth of the *Assertion*. And here you are pleas'd more than once to argue with me, as if I had been persuading you to assent to the Truth of it, whilst you are dubious about it; or to say it is very evident, whilst you think all *alleged* for it, to be only *Probability*, *strengthen'd by unproved Suppositions*; which, (you know) I am very far from doing. In order to shew how such Expressions ought to be interpreted, I instanced in the *Existence of our Blessed Lord*, before he was born of the *Virgin Mary*; and observed, that we might declare, that it is evident to all Men diligently reading *Holy Scriptures*, notwithstanding that some Learned and Considering Persons have denied it. To which you reply, that the Case is not parallel, because you hope you can prove this by better Evidence

than hath ever yet been alleged for the other. Now, I doubt very much, whether you can prove any thing, of that Nature, with greater Evidence than hath been alleged for the *distinct Offices* of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, from the Apostles Days*. But let this be as it will; the *Cases* are exactly parallel: For if you can say, that *it is evident*, &c. that our Saviour existed before his Humane Birth, notwithstanding some Sober, Learned, and Considering Persons have doubted of it; then, were you your self convinced of the *Truth* of the other Assertion, you might affirm it to be *evident*, &c. notwithstanding those great Dissenting Names mentioned by you. And this was all I intended by this Instance; to shew how unreasonable it was, to lay so great a Stress upon the *Manner of Expression* here used. And tho' you deny such a *Stress* to be laid upon the *Expression*; yet any one that will but turn to your Book, will find the greatest Part of what is urged by you upon this Head, to be founded wholly upon it.

The Proposition included in this Sentence is this, that *Bishops, Priests, and*



## A Defence of the

*Deacons*, with distinct Offices, subordinate to one another, have been in the Church from the *Apostles* Times. Now, who doth not know, that the main Dispute, and, I may say, the only Difficulty, here, was concerning the Superiority of *Bishops* over *Presbyters*, from the *Apostles* Days? and who doth not see, that there is no such thing implied in this Sentence, as that our *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, are exactly, in every respect, the same with the Primitive *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*. What signifies it, therefore, to allege, that *Preaching Deacons* were unknown in the *Apostles* Times? Doth *Preaching* destroy the Essentials of a Person's *Deaconship*? If it do not, It is not at all inconsistent, that a *Deacon* should be allowed to Preach. Nor should You Object this, who allow such Liberty of Preaching to any Persons as probationers; especially, when you consider, that He is not empowered absolutely by his *Ordination* to the Office of a *Deacon*, to Preach, but only conditionally, if He be called thereto. But, if St. *Stephen* were a *Deacon*, in the *Apostles* time, we read immediately after his Ordination by the *Apostles*, Act. the

## Reasonableness of Conformity.

71

that his Enemies were not able to resist the Wisdom and the Spirit by which He spake: So that his attending upon meaner Offices, did not at all hinder, but that He might lawfully Preach, as occasion offered. It is not needfull, for the Proof of this Assertion now before us, to shew, that there have been Deacons from the Apostles Days in the Church, with all the distinct Powers now assigned them among us, as you seem to demand; but it is sufficient, that there was such an Inferior Office in the Church from the beginning, with those distinct Powers, which have been ever been esteemed amongst us to be essential to a Deaconship: And this, I believe, I can hardly be denied. But, I confess, I thought not here of any Dispute about Deacons; but only about the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, from the beginning, invested with such distinct Powers, as the Church makes essential to Episcopacy. And this you might have seen, had you been but willing, from every thing I alleged under this Head. And if there have been Bishops over Presbyters, with such distinct Offices, as we make essential to each of them, you must

## A Defence of the

must acknowledge the Dispute about the Word *Order and Degree*, to be needless. This was what I aimed at. And I say again, that *Arch-bishop Usher hath added great Evidence* to this Proposition, in his Writings upon this Subject. *Bishop Pearson* I also alleged, as one who had assisted mightily in the same Cause. But you say, He came not out till after the *Ministers were silenced*. Why may not I say, then, that if his Writings had been Published before that, they would never have been *ejected* for not assenting to this Proposition; as you are pleased to insinuate, that if *Mr. Childingworth* (who declared *Dr. Hammond* unanswerable in this Point) had lived to see *Mr. Baxter's Disputations*, he would not have thought *Dr. Hammond* unanswerable? You might as well have added also, that he would have disclaimed his own Demonstration of the *Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy*; for at this rate, we may say any thing of the Greatest Men that have gone before us. But I find not one Argument here advanced against his *Demonstration*. Perhaps you may think you have sufficiently guarded against that, in the fol-

Part of your Defense. No, Sir, you thought it more worth your while here, to take up your Reader's Thoughts with another Business, and to charge me with a Crime, which I ever abhor'd. You tell your Reader, that I am *not over far here, in citing Mr. Baxter*: But I think my self oblig'd to vindicate my Representation of Mr. Baxter's Opinion in this Point. I said, therefore, in the first Place, that *Mr. Baxter himself thought it evident, that in the Primitive Reson. Church there was a Superiority over Pa-* of Confor. P. I. p. 109. *stis, maintain'd not only by the Apostles and Evangelists, but by other general and Church-Officers.* And can you say, but this is not truly, and fairly, his sense? But it seems, his Words are *in Bishops and Pastors, which, you say, with him were all one*: And you add, *not to serve my own Purpose, I leave out the Word Bishops, and mention only Pastors.* Now, if you cannot give the full Shadow of a Proof, that *my Purpose is at all served* by this Omission, or that his Sense could be more intelligibly express'd, so as to be more truly understood by my Reader, than as I have express'd it; you must acknowledge, that you have



have done me an Injury in this Charge against me. I can solemnly profess, that I had no Design to serve by leaving out that Word: And it is plain I could have none, because the putting it in doth not in the least alter the Sense of the Proposition. For what was I enquiring after? was it not a *Superiority over Pastors of particular Congregations*, and Mr. Baxter's Opinion concerning this? If he calls these *Pastors Bishops* also, doth that alter their Nature? Or is there any necessity of adding that, which is only another Word for the same thing? But truly I thought that the Reader might better understand his Meaning by the Word *Pastors* only, because he uses that Word in the ordinary Sense of it; and that the Addition of the other Word might rather confound, than explain his Meaning, because he useth it in a Sense, different from that in which it is ordinarily meant. Let us suppose, therefore, that I had said a Superiority over *Bishops*, or *Pastors*, where would have been the Alteration in the Sense? I know nothing more than a *Superiority* of those we call *Pastors*; tho over *Bishops* his Language perhaps: But they

getting but *Pastors* in our Sense, not  
*Bishops*, as the Word is now constantly  
 applied. What *Purpose*, therefore,  
 could it *serve* to omit this Word, unless  
 to render the Sense less liable to Mistake?  
 And how can you answer this Charge  
 against me, when you cannot but be  
 sensible, that the leaving out of the  
 Word alters not his Meaning, and that  
 the inserting it would not add a title  
 only? If Mr. *Baxter* call those *Bishops*,  
 whom others call *Pastors*, and those  
*Arch-bishops*, whom others call *Bishops*;  
 then, if he acknowledge *Arch-bishops*  
 for his *Bishops*, he acknowledges a Su-  
 periority over *Pastors*. This was all  
 that I laid to him in this Sentence, that  
 he acknowledged, in the Primitive  
 times, a Superiority over *Pastors*, main-  
 tained by general unfixed Church-Officers.  
 And he acknowledged this, or not? If  
 he do not, I confess my self mistaken;  
 he do, by what Law of the Gospel  
 you give your self this strange Liber-  
 ty of accusing me? This was the first  
 thing I ascribed to him. The next  
 thing was, that as to fixed *Bishops* of par-  
 ticular Churches, Superior in degree to *Pres-  
 byters*, he thought the Reception of them  
 in

in all Churches, was early, and general. The Words in your *Abridgment*, from whence I took this, are, *so early, and general, that he was free to admit the and resolved never to oppose.* But the Matter hath quite another Turn in *Life*, written by himself. And since you have been so hard upon me, leaving out a Word in representing Sense, tho' I gave you the *whole* of Opinion in the Point I was then upon, it is but fit you should be called upon to justify your self in this Matter, omitting a very considerable Part of Sentence; and, by this means, defeating the Reader of a considerable Part of his Sense. His own Words, in his *Life* are these—I *saw that the Reception of them in all the Churches was so immediate (even in the Days of one of the Apostles in some Churches) and so general, that I thought it a most improbable thing, that it had been contrary to the Apostles Mind we should never read that they themselves or any one of their Disciples that conversed with them, no, nor any Christian, or Retick in the World, should once speak, write a Word against it, till long after it was generally settled in the Churches.* The

Therefore, I resolved never to oppose. Certainly if you, by Virtue of being his *Adversary*, can leave out such material Passages as these, in favour of *Episcopacy*, without which we cannot know the whole of his Opinion; it may be very allowable to me, when I am representing his sense, to do it in as few Words as I can, provided I defraud not the Reader of the least Tittle of it. I am sure you have put into your *Abridgment* Passages of much less Importance than this: and upon what Grounds you thought fit to leave out all this, I cannot tell; and will not so much as say, that it was *serve any Purpose of your own*.

But, not content with this, you desire the Reader to observe, that tho' Mr. Baxter expressly says, that there is nothing in Scripture favouring the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, yet he is drawn in by this very Passage, as asserting, that it was evident to all reading the Scriptures, that there were such Bishops, and Priests, from the very Days of the Apostles. Now, if there be any thing like this in my whole Book, that Mr. Baxter asserts, that this is evident to all reading the Scriptures, (which is the thing you here lay to my Charge) I de-



I desire to forfeit my Credit for ever. But if there be not, I pray God forgive you this licentious way of handling your Adversary. I am sure, this is so from being true, that I here express

say, that Mr. Baxter asserts, that *there is nothing in Scripture favouring such Shops*: And it is very incredible, that I should so soon forget my self, and bring him in asserting, that it is evident in *reading Scripture, that there were such*

And I cannot imagine from what Passage you could possibly raise this Assertion, unless it be from this (p. 11) in which only I introduce Mr. Baxter asserting any thing concerning *Bishops The Point is, whether in Fact there in those early Days (viz. from the Apostles Times) Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Then follows, Mr. Baxter there were. These are my Words. Not concerning Deacons, I imagined no Controversie, as appears by my alleging thing at all relating to them. So taking it for granted, that all allow such an Order, what I intended to say upon the Sentence of Mr. Baxter's saying before, was this, that in those early Times (viz. from the Apostles Times)*

Reason. of  
Confor.  
P. 1. p.  
110.

were Fixed Bishops superior to Presbyters: But not a Word do I mention of his asserting, that *this was evident* on all reading the Scriptures. As for what I ascribed to him in this Sentence; surely what I have now quoted at large from him, will easily justify me. For if there were Bishops superior to Presbyters (and such must have had distinct Offices from ordinary Presbyters) in one of the *Apostles Days*; then Mr. Baxter says, that there were, in those *early Days, Bishops, and Priests*: Which is the whole of what I say Mr. Baxter says. How he came to judge so, and upon what Grounds he took up this Opinion, I pretended not to examine. And now I leave you to consider of this fresh Instance of your Candor towards me: And only assure you, that it is a great Concern to me, on your account, more than my own, that you can indulge your self in such a liberty of fixing your own Inventions upon me, and exposing me, this way, to the Aversion and Indignation of your Reader.

See,

Se<sup>t</sup>. 7. *Of the Objection against Declaration and Subscription, taken from the Burial-Office.*

**T**H E next Reason why you cannot comply with the Declaration and Subscription, is, because *you cannot consent to pronounce all saved to be buried, except the Unbaptiz'd, &c. to communicate, and Self Murderers; &c.* you cannot consent to read the Burial-Office over those who have been Notorious, Profligate, Unrepenting Sinners. As to the *first* Ground of this Objection, I still say, that it may be very properly said, that *God takes to himself the Salvation* even of Impenitent Sinners; which Phrase I consider'd by it self, because I found you did so, in your Representation of the Arguments of the *Ejected Ministers*. But I acknowledge that I cannot properly be said, that he does this of *his great Mercy*. And, as to *third*, I acknowledged before, that I could not, in the lowest sense of the Word, declare any *Hope* concerning such Sinners as you mention. But I adhere to my *Reasons*, why a Minister

in the *Church of England* brings not himself under an Obligation to use this Office in all *Cases* without variation. And because you have given the World a Story about *Arch-bishop Sancroft*, the Truth of which I find much question'd, I will also oppose to that the Judgment of the same great Man; for I am credibly inform'd, that he gave it as his Opinion to a Minister of a Parish, who consulted him upon this Occasion, that he was left to his Discretion in such Cases, and acted not against his Obligations, when he denied any part of that Office to such as all the World agree it was never design'd for. And tho' it may appear from the Story which you relate, supposing the Truth of it, that it might not have been fond of a *Parish Cure*; yet it doth not at all appear from that it was his *settled Opinion*, that Ministers bring themselves under an Obligation to use that *entire Form* in all possible Cases: For he had himself subscribed and declared his *Assent* and *Consent*, which he could not have done, had he thought that it was necessarily implied in them, that this *entire Form* was fit to be used over the most notorious and im-

G

penitent



## A Defence of the

*penitent Sinners.* And this is sufficient entirely to overthrow the *use* you make of this private Story.

But before I come to defend the *Reasons* I advanced for this, I must observe that the *second* Ground of your Objection, taken from those Words, *in sure and certain Hope of the Resurrection, &c.* can never stand good. When you represented this, you ought certainly to have transcribed the Words from the *Office* it self, and not from any other Book; and when you resolved to defend the Scruple founded upon this Sentence, you ought to have considered the Interpretation I gave of the whole, and to have shewn that it was not just and fair; which you wholly neglect. Now do you consider the *Reasons* I give, which the last *Collect* cannot interpret the Words; but only say, the *Office* is all a piece, the same as to the wickedest Man living, as to the most Pious, tho' certain it was never designed for the wicked Men. But you take notice that I omit your first Proof, that *these Words must refer to the Person interr'd, because they are the Continuation of the foregoing Declaration.* Now I omitted this only, becau

it was an Argument without the least appearance of Strength; and because I said what was sufficient to overthrow it, tho' I mentioned it not: For any Person may see, that these *scrupled Words* are not a Continuation of that Declaration, but a Sentence plainly distinct from it; and any Person may see, that it doth not follow, that because the *interr'd Person* is spoken of at the beginning of this *Paragraph*, therefore the *latter* part of it may not refer to all other *interr'd Persons*. And besides, I observ'd, that this same Sentence, as it is alter'd for *Burials* at Sea, must be interpreted of the *general Resurrection*, which will prove, that it may also very fairly be so interpreted in our ordinary Office, notwithstanding that the Person *interr'd* is spoken of particularly just before.

But I come now to vindicate my Reasons for asserting that a *Minister* is under no *Obligation* to use every Word of this Office over such *Impenitent Sinners*, as you mention. The *first* is this, that the Omission of these Sentences in such Cases, is more agreeable to the design of the *Church*, in prescribing this Form, than the using them, and therefore more

## A Defence of the

agreeable to the Obligations of one who ministers in this Church. This is apparent from the Supposition of *Discipline* in the Church, and from the Opinion of all who have written on this Subject. And sometimes you build mightily upon Quotations out of private Authors, though here, I am afraid, you will be backward to admit them. It lies upon you, therefore, to shew, against such Testimony, that it was the Design of the Church, that this entire *Office* should be used promiscuously over all; or that a *Conforming Minister* brings himself under a Promise, or Obligation, to use it so. This is a very material Point, and what I account all *Conforming Ministers* very much concerned in; and therefore I shall carefully consider your Arguments to prove these two Things.

1. You urge the Canon, which requires all *Ministers to bury any Corpse brought to the Church-yard, according to the Form prescribed in the Common-prayer book, &c.* In Answer to this, I acknowledge, that a *Minister* is oblig'd to obey all such *Canons* as the present *Governors* of the *Church* declare, or suppose to be in force. But in the first place,

do not think, that that strict Obedience to this *Canon*, about which we are disputing, in the Case of *Impenitent Sinners*, ever was, or is now, or ever will be, insisted on, by the *Governors* of the *Church*. And I think, that where a *Canon* hath been publicly neglected, with Connivence, or Approbation, or without a plain Injunction to restore the use of it, there it cannot be supposed to be obliging, any farther than the private Opinion of some Persons may judge it so. And that this hath been so, I can give you many, and very remarkable Instances, and those not Clan-destine, but approved of by our Superiors. And therefore I cannot see what it can import, to say, it is possible that our *Governors* may come to insist upon our using every Word of this *Office* over the most *profligate Sinners*. They never did yet, as I know of; and I think it time enough to consider what to do, when the *Terms of Conformity* are publicly altered. But, in the next place, I answer, that this *Canon* may oblige in the Sense intended in it, and yet not oblige in the rigorous Sense you have put upon it. It cannot be supposed, that



that it can oblige to the use of this entire *Office* in Cases, in which it is manifest, the *Church* originally designed it not to be used; and the *Allowance* in it, for *such exempt Cases* as are mentioned in the *Rubric*, leaves the *Minister* as much Liberty as the *Office* it self supposes: And indeed, it seems to me to be designed for nothing, but to prevent the indecent Delays and Neglects which might otherwise be made in the Case of burying the Dead; at least, it may be so designed, for any thing you have shewn or can shew, to the contrary.

2. You say, that a *Minister* who omits any of these *Sentences*, in the Case beforementioned, acts not agreeably to his *Subscription*, and *Declaration of Assent*, and *Consent*. In proof of this you allege, that his *Subscription*, that he will use the *Book of Common-prayer*, is as much as this, that *he will use it without any Variation*. In which I agree with you thus far, that it is a *Subscription* to the use of it *without Variation*, in such Cases in which the Design of the Church is answered without any Variation. But in extraordinary Cases, which all in the Church agree, the  
 ever

every Title of it cannot be used, without acting against the Original Design of the Church; in these Cases it cannot oblige to the *use* of every Title of it: and in Cases, where they who require this Subscription allow, and permit such a Latitude. Nor doth this *Omission* imply in the least, that there is any thing in the *Common-prayer-book* contrary to the *Word of God*, when it is used, as it was designed it should be: And sure, in interpreting any Book, we ought to consider the *Design* of those who compiled it. Now there is no Argument to prove, that they thought of using this *entire Form* over *Profligate, Impenitent Sinners*. And then, as for the *Declaration of Assent*, and *Consent*, to the *use* of the *Common-prayer-book*; this certainly cannot be meant of using every Title in it, in Cases, for which it was not designed, but of using it honestly and sincerely in all Cases, agreeably to the Original Design of the several *Offices* in it. This *Interpretation* is far from *making light of Declarations*: Nay, the rigorous Interpretation contrary to it, and the supposing that it extends to the *use* of it in Cases, for which it was not designed,

is really very injurious to the Nature and Use of such *Publick Declarations*. Before any of these Arguments can take place, you ought to have shewn, from other Reasons, that it was the design of the *Church*, and of the *Governors* of it, that this *Office* should be used promiscuously over all; and that the contrary to this hath never been allowed. But I find nothing like this in any thing alleged by you.

3. You argue from the Inconveniences a *Minister* may bring upon himself, by omitting, in the *Cases* before mentioned, the least part of the *Form* prescribed. All I can say as to the *Fact* is, that I know my self many Instance of such *Omission*, but not one of an Inconvenience consequent upon it. But supposing these Inconveniences possible (for they are not so much as probable, this is nothing to our Purpose; for this will not prove, either that it was the design of the *Church*, that this entire *Form* should be promiscuously used; or that a *Conforming Minister* brings himself under any Obligation so to use it, and therefore it touches not the Consequence at all. If a Man conform sincerely

and suffer some temporal Inconvenience for doing his Duty in *Conformity*, He may have as great inward Satisfaction in this, as another may have in *Ministering* in a *Separation*, for fear of these temporal Inconveniences.

My other Argument for omitting these Passages, was wholly designed to shew the Reasonableness of such Omission to some *Church-men*, upon their own Principles; and not to convince *You* any farther than as it shews, That in some Cases this *Office* may be denied (notwithstanding the *Canon*) upon the Principles of the greatest *Church-men* amongst us: And sometimes you seem very fond of appealing to their Opinion in this *Conjuncture*. This once, therefore, I hope, we agree; and so I leave the *Reader* to Judge upon the whole, what just Reason you had, under this Head, to express your Pity for those who (in your obliging Language you say) are in an *Ecclesiastical Pound*; whom if you did truly pity, you would not have laboured so much, to have made it straiter than their *Superiors* have done.

Set,



Se<sup>t</sup>. 8. *Of the Objection taken from the Rule to find Easter-day.*

**T**HIS Rule, rightly understood, told you, *neither contradicts the Table in the Common-Prayer-Book, nor the common Almanacks, which agree with the Rule*: And I still say the same. The Rule (as hath been known and understood for many Years past, by all *Conformists*, who thought it worth while to enquire after it) hath Reference to the *first Column* printed in many *Editions* of the *Common-Prayer-book*, which was inserted chiefly for the sake of this *Rule*; and the meaning of it is manifestly this, and could be no other, *Easter day is always the first Sunday after the first Full-moon*, (which Full-moon is to be found out by the *Kalendar* in which there is a *Column* for that purpose) *which happens, &c.* I say, This is the meaning of the *Rule*, and ever was known, by Persons who understood the *Kalendar*, to be so: And this neither contradicts the *Table*, which was framed by this Rule; nor *Easter-day* in the *Almanacks*, which is always the same that it is in the *Table*. Now in order to pro-

Reasonableness of Conformity.

91

this false, you Interpret it thus: *Easter-day* is always the first Sunday after the first Full-moon, according to the Reformation of the *Kalendar*. Now, if you had no mind this *Rule* should be false, and we should endeavour to prove it so by the *Moon in the Heavens*; I doubt not you would say, this must be judg'd of as it was originally intended; and that it is unjust to interpret it otherwise. To say, That the *Moons* in the *Almanack* are more exact, is nothing against the *Truth* of this *Rule*. Is it not true, That this is such a Day of the Month according to the *Old-Style*, because it is not the same according to the *New-Style*? Is it not truly said, That this is such a Day of our Lord, by those who are known to go according to the *Vulgar Use*; because it is not so, perhaps, in *Truth*, and exact *Chronology*? And may it not be true, That *Easter-day* is the first Sunday after such a particular Full-moon, according to that Column in our *Kalendar*; because it is not so, according to the *Full-moons* in the Heavens, in *Truth*, and Philosophical Exactness of Speech? But, you say, It is no longer fit to be a *Rule*, because it is *unintelligible*. And again;

## A Defence of the

again, (p. 241.) *It cannot be a Rule to find Easter for Ever, because it depends upon way of Calculation not now in use: Now is never (as I know of) called a Rule find Easter for Ever, which I suppose you took up (as your worthy Friend also has done) from others, without looking it to the Common-Prayer-book: And as for its being Unintelligible, I cannot be your Understanding; but I dare say you could easily understand it, did you think it worth your while: And, you see, it is not so unintelligible, but that the Table was made by it, and all our Easter-days are observed according to it, and any one that pleases may understand this way of Calculation. At present, indeed, I see plainly, that you understand it not; for otherwise I cannot imagine That you should undertake to present the Reader with an Account of several Easter-days, according to the Rule; and at the same time represent the Full-moon mentioned in the Rule, according to the late Reformation of the Kalender, and not according to that Kalender to which the Rule refers. I pray, by what Rule was the Table in the Common-Prayer-book drawn up? If by this same Rule, then*

is evident, That the *Rule* is intelligible, and doth not contradict the *Table*: And if it was drawn up according to the *Full-moons* in the way I have now mentioned; then is it plain also, that the *Full moons* mentioned in the *Rule*, are not the *Full-moons* you have here set down from the *Common Almanacks*; but those which are to be found according to the first *Common* in our *Kalendar*: But, indeed, at your rate of arguing here, you may prove any Proposition in the *World* false; for it is but resolving to take some principal Word in it, in a *Sense* different from what was intended; and after that, 'tis easy to prove the *Falseness* of it: But how unmanly is it in *You*, after you have confessed that you do not know whether it be true, or no, if rightly understood, to cry out twice in the same Words, *I'm for standing by the Moon in the Heavens, and let the Moon in Mr. Hoadly's Kalendar, or according to his Rule, shift itself*; as if the *Controversy* had been, not whether the *Rule*, Interpreted as it ought to be, were true; but, whether the *Full-moons* in our *Kalendar* answer'd exactly to the *Moon* in the *Heavens*. Thus have I endeavour'd to set this Matter



ter right once more : But as for your *worthy Friend*, who hath been called to this weighty Point ; He may assure Himself, whoever he be, I shall have nothing to do with Him, till he learn more *Manners* (not to say *Religion*) than to ridicule and insult the *Common-Prayer-book* ; and more *Wit*, than to meddle with what He understands nothing of.

SECT. 9. *Of the Objection taken from Apocryphal Lessons.*

**U**NDER this Head, I told you That I would not plead for retaining any thing justly suspected to be *Fabulous*, in the Service of the Church. But I made some *Queries* about the *Lawfulness* of reading these *Lessons*, which they are appointed in our Church, which *Lawfulness* is, of it self, sufficient to make it *Lawful* for any *Minister* to presume to do it. To these *Queries* you request to give a direct *Answer* : But instead of it, you ask me, whether it had not been more *fitting*, to have appointed new but *Lessons* out of the *Canonical Books* for this is all I can make of your *Query*. To which I answer, That, consider

all things, I think it had been better to do so. And now I have answer'd this, I hope you will answer mine, whether it be not lawful to *comply* with the present Order, though it should be our private Opinion, that a *better* might have been made? But you say again, The Church, by appointing *Apocryphal Lessons* in the same *Kalendar*, in which she appoints Canonical, takes a *Method* to abate that peculiar Veneration for the Canonical Books, that ought to be most carefully heightened. Now certainly, any Minister in the Church of England may take such care, that this peculiar Veneration shall not in the least be abated: And all in the Church of England, that know any thing, know the Difference that is made between these Books, and the others, and that it is expressly declared, That they are not to be applied to establish any Doctrine. And I say it again, That I never yet heard of an Instance, of any Person who lost any part of his Veneration for the Canonical Books, by the reading of others in our Church. The Story you relate of the Man in the late *Tempest*, that had recourse to the *Apocrypha*, under the Notion of Scripture, is nothing to this purpose;

purpose; unless you can assure us, That he was a *Conformist*, and one in his right Senses; that he ran into this Mistake by frequenting the *Prayers* of our *Church* on *Week-days*, when every body knows we have few in our *Congregations*, of those who are most apt to be thus imposed upon; or that he was led to it by necessity studying our *Rubrick*: For by what appears here, we know not but that He might have been a *Dissenter*, and foolishly led into this Mistake by nothing but having a *Bible*, in which both *Canonical* and *Apocryphal Books* were bound up together. But to whatever you have fallen upon this Head, I think it a sufficient Reply which I gave before; That if there be no *Sin* to read these *Books*, it is much better to comply in this, than to divide the *Church* for the sake of this *Order*. To which you answer, this of *dividing the Church* is a groundless Charge; for those are the *Dividers* who impose this: As if it were not plain, That what I intended was, that *Compliance* in what is not *sinful* in your own Accounts, is better than *separating* from the *Church* on this Account; and as if it were not plain, That in order to Peate in this World, it is

Duty of *Inferiors*, to comply with what they account Weakness in their *Superiors*, as well as of *Superiors* to yield to *Inferiors*: But this belongs to another Head. And I shall add here, That you might, without *separating*, take as effectual Care, that no People should confound the *Apocryphal* and *Canonical Books*, as you can do in your own Method. As for the imposing these *Lessons*, or retaining them, I have no hand in it; the *Compliance* in reading them is the Point: And since you cannot say, that you think that *sinful* in it self, or prove it to be so, I think you might have spared the pains you have here been at. And for what is here said of my self, I have been so accusom'd to such sort of Usage, ever since I had any thing to do with you, that I am not now at all solicitous, what Opinions you entertain, or express, of me.

I said it was hard, that you should represent it as Injurious to the People, or Unjustifiable in it self, that these *Apocryphal Lessons* in General, should be read them; and some *Canonical Books* omitted, curtailed, and mutilated: And I gave you my Reasons for this, *viz.* that there was no Obligation to read every *Canonical Chapter*, in the *Publick*

H  
Worship



*Worship of God*; that some of the *Canonical Chapters*-may be improper, unintelligible, of very little Concern to Christian People, wholly out of their reach, of little Advantage, either to the informing their Minds in any important Matter, or to the raising their *Devotions*; and that many of the *Apocryphal Lessons* are more for the Edification of the People, than any of those Chapters which are omitted. And can you say, That none of the Canonical Chapters, or any part of them, can be *improper* for a popular Christian Congregation; or unintelligible; or of little Advantage? Let any one peruse your own List of Chapters omitted (which I do not now examine any farther than to remark, that you have inserted some Chapters which are not omitted;) and he will find, how many concern the *Jewish Rites* and Ceremonies; how many are full of difficult Places, and hard Prophecies, not to be accounted for by the most Learned Men amongst us; how many are Repetitions of the same pieces of History that have been read in other Places; and will judge himself how pardonable at least it is, not to insert such into the *Public Service*.

Service, but to leave them to the private Studies of Christians. I am sure, I have said nothing, however you would represent me, to insinuate that the Canonical Chapters omitted were not excellent, according to what they were designed for; but only that some Canonical Chapters might not be proper for popular Congregations of Christians assembled for the Worship of God: And against this, you have not advanced one single Argument; but only endeavour'd, after an unmanly manner, to expose me to your People, as one who had insinuated, that *there were none of all the p. 234.* Chapters omitted, but what were improper, unintelligible, &c. which you know I have not done; and as one Zealous for reading the *Apocryphal Lessons*, which I have not at all pleaded for, in general, but as for a lawful thing. And how you can answer it to God and your own Conscience, twice under this Head, to produce out of my Book, the same Sentence, and to raise Indignation against me, without attempting to prove the *Falshood* of it, I leave you to consider. If it be not true, that *many of the Apocryphal Lessons are of more use in a Publick Congregation than*

*any of the Chapters omitted*: You should have shewn it plainly by Instances; but surely, a Man of your Latitude cannot think the bare Name of *Canonical* sufficient to make a Chapter useful in a Christian Congregation. This is no more than what I think I might have said, of many modern Christian Writings, and of some of Mr. *Baxter's* Practical Pieces: And if it be true, it deserves no severe Censure at all. But, not to be content with one single and fair Representation of this horrid *Tenet* of mine; but, in the very next Page, to introduce it again, not to confute it, but to abuse it, by leaving out the Word *many*, and so representing me as saying *that* of the *Apocryphal Lessons* in general, which I say only of *some*, and have expressly denied of *others*: Give me leave, Sir, to tell you, this is unworthy of a Man; and what, it is beyond the Power of you and all your Friends, to reconcile, I will not say with Christian Candour, but with Common Honesty: Unless you can sincerely say, you forgot that Word which you had inserted but the Page before; and shew your self ready to do Justice in this matter.

sect. 10. *Of the Objection taken from the Mistranslation of the Psalter.*

**Y**OUR Objection was, That the *dissenting Ministers* could not *declare and subscribe*, that the *Psalter*, appointed to be used, hath nothing in it contrary to the Word of God, because of that Passage, *Psal. 105. 28. They were not obedient to his Word*, which is contrary to the *Hebrew*, *They were obedient*—

In answer to this, I shewed, That these two Sentences, manifestly understood of different Persons, contradicted not one another. This you own expressly; and yet say, That the Difficulty still remains. The Difficulty was, as you have again printed it, That this Passage in the *Psalter* was *contrary to the Word of God*; as it was contrary to the *Hebrew*. I shewed, it was not *contrary*. You acknowledge it: And how then can the Difficulty still remain, unless you point out *other Passages* which you think *contrary to the Word of God*? For if there be no others, which you think so; you may with the greatest Solemnity subscribe, or declare, That there is nothing in



*A Defence of the*

in the Pfalter contrary to the Word of God: Which can imply no more, but that this is your serious Judgment.

SECT. 11. *Of the Objection taken from the Athanasian Creed.*

**U**NDER this Head I argued, If you acknowledge that this Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity is true, and agreeable to the Word of God; then you ought to acknowledge it a good general Proposition, that whoever doth not believe it, shall be Condemned at the Last Day. To this you Reply, That you may own a great many Truths as agreeable to the Word of God, and yet not think an explicit belief of them necessary to the Salvation of all Persons in all Capacities and Circumstances: Which I see not how you can think a sufficient Answer to one who made not an explicit Belief of this Explication necessary to any but such as had Capacities, and Opportunities, of knowing it to be agreeable to the Word of God. Thus I explained the *damnatory Sentences* in the Creed: And thus have all the considerable Persons in the Church, who have applied them to

this particular Explication, interpreted them, as far as I can find. But you quite mistake me, when you think that I compared this *Matter with* Faith in Christ, in the Sense you oppose: For I only argued, That if you could say, that all who believe not in Him, shall be Condemned, without including any but those who have Abilities and Opportunities of believing in Him: You might also say, That they who believe not this Explication (which you own to be agreeable to the Word of God) shall be Condemned, without including any but such as have Capacities and Opportunities of perceiving it so to be. But I find not a Word against this.

Sect. 12. *Of the Objection taken from the Office of Confirmation.*

WE now come to the last of your Objections against the Declaration and Subscription, taken from the Rubric in the Office of Confirmation, which Orders, That none be admitted to Communion before he be Confirmed, &c. Now, in answer to this Objection I said, that it was a very becoming thing,

H 4

that

that all Persons should in the most solemn manner take upon themselves their *Baptismal Covenant*: And surely, it cannot be an Exception against this (which you allow highly reasonable) either that this is to be done in Presence of the highest Officer in the *Church*: Or, That the *Person* who officiates uses a *Prayer*, in which there is an Expression which you do not like, tho' no part of what is there prayed for. Could I not free the *Form* used from all Exceptions; yet this could not be a reason for a *Christian* to refuse to be *Confirmed*, because an improper Expression is used by another in one part of the Office, unless he be either a *weak* or *prejudiced* Person: And I cannot think that you your self can judge it a sufficient ground of scrupling the thing it self, because the *Bishop's* Prayer hath a passage in it you do not like. As for my saying that you, *Dissenting Ministers*, would have joined in imposing some things upon the People, &c. as far as *Compliance* with the use of them is joining in it; that belongs to another place: And I hope will not be said again to be an *unproved Assertion*.

## C H A P. III.

## Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience.

W H A T I first observed under this Head was, That in drawing up this *Article*, you say, That Ministers in the Church of England are required to swear Subjection to their Ordinary, according to the Canons of the Church; and that you speak as if no one could be ordained in the Church of England, without taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience; Whereas, the Words, according to the Canons of the Church, are not in that form of Words, in which the Ordained promise Subjection to their Ordinary; and Assertions may be ordained in the Church of England, without taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience. To which you answer, These Words, indeed, are not in the Oath, but the Word Canonical implies as much. Now, 1. Supposing you are never so certain of this, yet in presenting the Terms required, you ought not to insert your Interpretations of them



them (which are controverted) as the *Terms* required; especially in this place before you have so much as attempted to prove yours to be the only true Interpretation of the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*. But 2. I was not speaking of that *Oath*, but of the promise of Subjection to the *Ordinary*, in the *Office of Ordination*; and in that there is not so much as the *Word Canonical* to excuse your Addition. But the *Promise*, you say, is *limited to a certain Sense by the Oath that came after*. So that I see, you are resolved to leave us no room to make our escape: For tho' the *Word Canonical* be not here, yet it is the *Oath* to be taken afterwards; and therefore, it is implied here, because that *Oath* was designed to explain the *Promise*. Now, I see not to what purpose it can be, to give a second Reply to *one*, who is so ready to give us any invention of his own, rather than he will appear in the least mistaken. But at the same time you should have considered whether you needed to have alleged the *Word Canonical* in your Defence. Since the *Reasons* against taking the *Oath*, as they are represented by you, in the Name of the *Ejected Ministers*, app

to be equally strong, whether the Word Canonical had been inserted in the *Oath*, or not. You say farther, That you never thought, much less affirm'd; that Persons were obliged to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience at the time of their Ordination. Let any one judge of this from your Representation of this matter now Reprinted, in which you give this Account. *In the Form of making, ordaining, &c. this Question is required to be put to Priests and Deacons, at the time of their Ordination, 'Will you reverently, &c. The Answer to be returned is, I will do so, &c. An Oath also is administred to the Ordained, of this Tenour, &c. Had not Reason from hence, to say what I did? But let us now come to the Oath it self, against which you say the Objections lie.* In order to enquire into the true Signification of this *Oath*, I first set down the Reason of its being imposed, viz. because a Person is now coming into the Office of one particular Bishop, to act under his Eye and Inspection: From hence I argue, That it can refer to nothing but the Injunctions of this particular Bishop. To which you answer, *It is not to be so far extended, as if it were*

## A Defence of the

were wholly at the Bishop's Pleasure, who to require of his Clergy. I never said That this was wholly at the Bishop's Pleasure: But you acknowledge, that it is thus far true, that this *Oath* refers to the Injunctions of this particular Bishop that a Clergyman is not bound, by the *Oath*, to observe Canons, which he himself dislikes, if his Bishop do not call upon him.

p. 291.

From whence it follows, That notwithstanding this *Oath*, a Clergyman is not obliged to observe any one of the *Canons* (if he should dislike them all) antecedently to his Bishop's Command. If this be so, how can it be true, That this *Oath* carries in it a plain Obligation to comply with the *Canons*, and submit them in their stated Practice, unless a Minister have a Dispensation to the contrary or that an Obligation to comply with things required by the *Canons*, as law and honest, is taken for granted in this *Oath* antecedently to the future commands of the Bishop, as it is said in your Representation? If a Clergyman be not obliged to observe *Canons* which he dislikes, uncommanded by his Bishop; then can this *Oath* imply in it an antecedent Obligation to observe the *Canons*; or

and it refer to any thing but the future commands of this particular *Bishop*?

After this, I proposed an Interpretation of this *Oath* in these Words, *I swear that I will yield such an Obedience as is due, according to the Laws of Christ's Church, upon an inferior Presbyter to his Bishop, with a sincere, ready, and submissive Obedience, in all lawful and honest things, i. e. provided he enjoin nothing but what I apprehend in my Conscience to be lawful and honest.* Where it is plain, That I interpret the Word *Canonical*, as joined to the Word *Obedience*, after the same manner as the Word *true* is; and as signifying the Nature and Quality of the *Obedience* required, not the Instances in which it is to be exercised: And yet this Interpretation, you say, yields what Mr. Baxter would for, unless Mr. H. mean something different from ancient and modern Ecclesiastical Canons, by the *Laws of Christ's Church* which he mentions. If all that Mr. Baxter contended for, were this, that a *Minister* promised in this *Oath*, sincere and ready Obedience; such an Obedience as hath always been esteemed from an Inferior to a Superior; and only in such things as he himself should



should judge to be Lawful: I am heartily glad to hear it; and not only yield that this is what the *Oath* obliges to, but contend, that nothing else can be meant in it. And whatever Laws or Canons the Church you understand, it will conform to the same: For I speak only of an *Obedience* of such a Nature, so ready and sincere, as is due from a *Presbyter* to his *Bishop*. But in representing my Interpretation, you leave out, for Brevity's sake, those Words, *viz. a sincere, real and Submissive Obedience*; by which means your *Readers* cannot so easily see the meaning, or judge of the difference between the two Interpretations. If you grant that this is all intended, that you will pay a sincere and ready Obedience to my *Bishop* in all things which I think Lawful; then this part of our Dispute is at an end. If you do not; then you cannot say, I have yielded all that Mr. *Baxter* pleaded for: For this is directly contrary to what Mr. *Baxter* pleaded for; who made the *Oath* have reference to the Canons, and be an Oath of Obedience to *them*; and only to a particular *Bishop*. But you say *If the Oath refer to what the Bishop*

*it to require, 'tis meerly within the compass*  
 the Canons. If it be, this will not prove  
 our former Representation of this Mat-  
 ter to be reasonable: for, not withstanding  
 this, it may not touch the *Canons*, but as  
 they become the Injunctions of the Bi-  
 shop, and then also the Words, *in all lawful*  
*and honest things*, leave a sufficient power  
 to demur on any particular Canon  
 proposed. But who doth not know, that  
 it shews any thing of our *Church*, that  
 are happen frequent Occasions for the  
 Bishop to interpose, in Cases not touched  
 by the *Canons*? and who would not ra-  
 ther think, that this *Oath* was designed  
 to a view principally to such Cases?  
 Again, I say, That *the last Words*, in all  
 lawful and honest things, refer to all the  
 Injunctions of the Bishop; and do suppose,  
 that every Injunction be lays upon you, may  
 be unlawful and dishonest: But it is  
 in me to suppose this, you say, because  
 the Bishop is confined to the *Canons*, &c.  
 Now, this is the same Mistake repeated:  
 tho' the Bishop may be so confined, as  
 he cannot enjoin things contrary to  
*Canons*; yet he is not so confined;  
 that he may often enjoin things not  
 contained in the *Canons*. But supposing  
 it

it true, that he is so confined; yet it may be also true, that it is supposed possible in this Oath, that every one of his *Injunctions* may be *unlawful*, even those that concern things enjoined by the *Canons*. *This*, you say, *seems to argue Forgetfulness of what I had said a little above*, viz. That in this Oath Men swear an Obedience according to the Laws of Christ's Church. But certainly, you are resolved not to understand my meaning, or to let your *Reader* see my own Words: For, all that I say is, That this Oath Ministers swear such a real and sincere Obedience, as the Laws of Christ's Church require from a *Presbyter* to his Bishop; but this is to be practised only in such Instances, as they themselves think lawful. This I have plainly and frequently expressed: And he doth this contradict what I afterwards say, that the last Words of the Oath suppose, that it is possible all the Bishop's Injunctions may be *unlawful*? Cannot he promise such a ready Obedience to His Injunctions in all lawful things; and yet suppose that he may enjoin unlawful things? supposing all Ministers Judges of the Lawfulness of all the Injunctions of the

Diocesan

Diocesans, you say, this will not reconcile you to the Oath, because the *Rules* they ordinarily go by, are *ensnaring* and *unjustifiable*, and you know no warrant they have to require such an Oath. Now you have often acknowledged Episcopal Government to be *lawful*: and how that can be exercised without the Submission of *Presbyters*, I know not. And if Submission may be practised, in all *Cases* which you think *lawful*; certainly it may be *promised* in all such *Cases*. And therefore, whilst you avoid the speaking to this point, this is all unnecessary; and tends only to make your *Reader* believe, that there are frequently such Grievances in the Church, as they that minister in it know little of. We think it sufficient to resolve to *demurr*, when any thing is enjoin'd, which we think *unlawful*; and not care to enter into other Parhs, for fear on that such things should ever be enjoined. I say, indeed, That this Oath can refer to nothing but the *future Commands* of one Bishop, and have proved it at large; and find not any thing advanced against it, but the same Mistake of my Interpretation of the Oath. *I have acknowledged*, you say, *that the Oath refers*



## A Defence of the

to Obedience, according to the *Laws of Christ's Church*. I am ashamed so often to put you in mind, that my Interpretation doth in so many Words declare That the intent of the Oath is to promise such a ready Obedience as the *Laws of the Church* require from a *Presbyter* to his Bishop, in all things which he thinks *lawful*. And may not this ready Obedience be promised to the *future Commands* only of the Bishop? Why should you so often argue, as if you had never your self read my Interpretation? for one would think if you had, you could not make so strange an use of those Words (*according to the Laws of Christ's Church*) mentioned in it. The *Parallel case*, I proposed, I cannot but think very much to the purpose; which was only to shew, That an Under-Officer may take an Oath of true and *legal Obedience* to the *Lord-Mayor* in all lawful things without concerning himself with anything but the *future Commands* of the *Lord-Mayor*, and may demur upon any of his Injunctions, notwithstanding the Oath: And so likewise, that a *Presbyter* may lawfully swear true and canonical Obedience to his Bishop, with the same Conditions, and upon the same Terms. An

And it is sufficient, That you acknowledge a *Submission* to Bishops lawful; without proving in this place their *original Right* to lay any Injunctions upon *Presbyters*. Against this, as I have thus again stated it, you have alleged nothing to prove that a *Clergyman* promises, in this Oath, Obedience to any Commands, but what he himself shall judge lawful; and this is all I am concerned about. As for my charging you with *Prevarication*, I can find no such thing in my Book; and if you will point me to the place, I promise you to expunge it. My *Harangue*, as you style it, in the following Pages, had but too just a Foundation: And I appeal to more unprejudiced Judges than your selves, if your Management of this Head gave me not a fair Occasion of saying something against such hard and unjust *Interpretations*. But still you insist, That according to my own Interpretation, a *Minister* is bound to *obey* the Canons, when called upon by his Bishop: And I again answer, that, according to my Interpretation, He cannot be obliged by this Oath to obey any Injunctions, but what He himself thinks lawful. You still misun-

derstand me, and apply those Words, according to the *Laws of Christ's Church*, to the *Instances of Obedience*, which I applied only to the *Nature* of it. I may promise such a ready Obedience as the *Laws* of the Church require from a *Presbyter* to his Bishop, in all lawful things; and yet demur about the Lawfulness of any of his *Injunctions*, though they be the same with the antecedent *Injunctions* of the Church. I say, I may demur, notwithstanding any thing in this Oath, in which I only promise a ready Obedience in all lawful things. But it is an unaccountable thing to me, That you should allege hardly one Consideration under this Head, but what is founded upon your own Mistake; and that you cannot understand that Obedience to the Canons, antecedently obliging, cannot be Obedience to a particular Bishop; and therefore cannot be promised in an Oath which wholly respects one particular Bishop. I have said, and still do say, That Obedience is due to those Canons, which are supposed to be in force, without this Oath; and that Obedience to the Canons is not promised in this Oath, but when they become

the *Commands* of my particular Bishop: And that then no *absolute Obedience* is promised in this *Oath*, because the last Words give you a Liberty of judging about the Lawfulness of any of his *Injunctions*. And this is not to *say* and *unsay*, or to run *backward* and *forward*, as you would make your *Readers* believe; for these things are perfectly reconcilable. And methinks, you, who have acknowledged, *That a Clergyman is not bound, by this Oath, to observe Canons, which himself dislikes, if his Bishop do not call upon him*, might easily acknowledge, that this is no Oath of Obedience to the *Canons*, but to a particular Bishop; and that since the Limitation, *in all lawful and honest things*, restrains the whole Obedience promised in this Oath, it cannot but belong to every particular Injunction, of what Nature soever, and give a Liberty, and a Right to demur upon any Command laid upon us, unless we be otherwise obliged not to demur upon some particular Commands. Now, if there be any Matters of Practice to which we are otherwise obliged, the reason of our not demurring upon them, is not because they are the Injunctions of this



this particular *Bishop*; but because we are, on other Accounts, obliged not to do it. I say, therefore, that no *absolute Obedience* is promised in this Oath to the *Canons*, even when they become the *Injunctions* of the *Bishop*; because this Oath promises no Obedience, but one limited to such *Injunctions* only as we think lawful; and our Obligation to obey the *Canons* results not from this Oath any farther, than as they are enjoyn'd, and as we think them *lawful Injunctions*. And it is your own willingness to find out Contradictions where there are none, that makes these things unintelligible to you.

But, because I acknowledge that one who designs to minister in this Church, ought first to be satisfied about such *Canons* as respect his own Behaviour, and are supposed to be now in force, and resolve to conform to them; You say, *You desire no more than what is contained in this Concession, and easily to be inferred from it: For if this will hold, then it follows, that you should not act honestly and fairly in taking this Oath; and that others who take this Oath, (which was designed to give the Church assurance on their behalf) before they are so satisfied may*

charged with *Disimulation*; and so, every thing that you aim at. But let us a little consider this. I acknowledge, That a Minister ought, on other Accounts, to obey the *Canons* now in force, without any respect to this Oath; therefore it follows, That *this Oath was designed to give the Church assurance on this behalf*; therefore it follows, That he is obliged to obey them by this Oath; therefore it follows, That he cannot *honestly* promise to obey a particular Bishop, in all *lawful things*, without being satisfied about the Lawfulness of the *Canons*. You acknowledged but now, that this Oath obliged not to the observation of *Canons*, unless a Person be called upon by his Bishop to observe them; and yet here you affirm that this Oath was designed to give the Church *assurance that we will obey the Canons*: While your former Acknowledgment implies in it, That the Oath contains no such Assurance in it, if it should chance that our particular Bishop should not call upon us to obey them. You know, that I have all this while been contending, That this Oath respects not the *Canons*; and yet you will bring me in here, as yielding that

that it doth respect them ; but it is by fixing Consequences upon me, directly contrary to what I have been pleading for, and which only help to prove, how unwilling you are to understand me once aright under this Head. And after your own egregious and palpable Mistakes, it is very pleasant to find you complaining of the *confusedness* of your *Adversaries*, only to give your self an opportunity of presenting to the World, an useless *Account of Nothing* to the purpose : In which I shall not follow you any farther, than to shew, That, supposing the truth of your own *Historical Narration*, you cannot draw the Shadow of an Argument from it, to maintain your Interpretation of our Oath of Canonical Obedience to the Bishop.

In the first place, you cannot certainly think this a good Argument. Several *Councils*, down to the Year 675. decreed That the Ecclesiastical Canons should be observed ; therefore, it is plain, this Oath now required of Canonical Obedience to a *particular Bishop*, was designed to promise, not Obedience to this Bishop only, but Obedience to the Canons. You your self have acknowledged, that

his *Oath* refers not to the *Canons*, but as they become the *Injunctions* of this particular *Bishop*. Now, certainly, if had been designed, as you suppose, to check the *Decrees* of these *Councils*, the same absolute Obligation to obey the *Canons*, would have been plainly expressed in it.

Again, the 10th *Canon* of the 11th *Council* of *Toledo*, required a *Subscription* from all to be ordained, that *they would* *no wise contradict the Canonical Rules*; and in all *Things give due Honour and Obedience to their Ecclesiastical Superiours*. Now this, I think, makes very much against you in several respects. 1. What retained of this nature in our *Church*, at the time of *Ordination*, is only a promise of submission to our Superiours, without any mention of the *Canonical Rules*: Which shews rather, that our *Church*, in retaining only one part of *us*, avoided the bringing Ministers under any such absolute Promise relating to the *Canons*. 2. The *Oath* of *Canonical Obedience* is required, amongst us, on our coming to settle in the *Diocess* of one particular *Bishop*; and regards not only, without the mention of *Canonical*



*nonical Rules.* 3. You acknowledge your self that our *Oath* obliges not to Obedience to the *Canons*, but as they become the Injunctions of our particular Bishop: And, therefore, according to your self, this is vastly different from a *Subscription*, that implies an absolute Promise to obey all the *Canons*; and not to be interpreted by it. 4. Here is plain distinction made between Obedience to the *Canons*, and Obedience to Ecclesiastical Superiors. And from hence I argue, that an *Oath* in which there is promised a *Canonical Obedience* to one Bishop only, could not be framed in imitation of this. Nay, that it follows rather that the *Imposers* did not intend to require in it a Promise parallel to the forasmuch as the express mention of *Obedience to Canonical Rules* is avoided and Obedience to the Bishop only mentioned: Whereas it is evident that where a Promise of Obedience to the *Canons* was anciently intended, there was expressed in so many Words; as Obedience to Superiours made a distinct Matter from it. To proceed,

After the Year 700, many Bishops took an *Oath* which made them en-  
Val

Vassals to the See of Rome. Well, Our  
 of Canonical Obedience to a *Bishop*, in  
 all lawful and honest Things, can receive  
 little Light from this piece of History.  
 But you say, or have said, is a promise of  
 absolute *Subjection* to the *Canons* in force:  
 and as far as it is a Promise of Obedi-  
 ence to the *future Commands* of the *Bi-*  
*shop*, you acknowledge it no Promise of  
 future *Subjection*, but limited as much  
 as any one could desire. Nor is it at  
 all probable, that at the *Reformation*,  
 our Models should be taken from *Papal*  
*Interpretations*.

Many *Canons*, in following *Councils*,  
 contained that *Bishops* should manage  
 themselves according to the *Canons*:  
 and that *Presbyters* should be subject to  
 them, according to the *Canons*. And  
 it follows inevitably, that our present  
 of Canonical Obedience to a particu-  
 lar *Bishop*, in all lawful and honest  
 things, is a promise of absolute Obe-  
 dience to the *Canons*; For that it was  
 decreed in these *Councils*, if  
 Obedience to the *Canons* were de-  
 manded. To be subject to *Bishops*, accord-  
 ing to the *Canons*, is to pay them that  
 due obedience, which the *Canons* say  
 is

is due to them; but is a Thing distinct from *Obedience* to the *Canons* that concern a *Clergy-Man's* behaviour, whether the *Bishop* enforce them or not: Just as the *Obedience* which, you say, was promised by *Bishops* to the *Pope*, according to the *Authority of the Canons*, is but an absolute *Obedience* as the *Canons*; made since his usurpation, required; not *Obedience* to *Canons* concerning the own behaviour, where He did not interpose.

*Bishops* swore *Subjection to the Pope*, *Obedience to the Canons*, in two distinct Forms of Words. It cannot follow from hence, surely, that this was the Pattern of our *Oath*, in which all the *Obedience* promised is express'd in one Sentence; and terminated in one Person; and limited only to *Lawful Things*. You may observe, throughout all your instances, that where *Obedience* to the *Canons* was intended, was express'd plainly, and made whole distinct from *Obedience* to the *Bishop*. Now all the *Obedience* we promise to the *Bishop*: The other part is plainly rejected from this solemn *Oath*.

But now we come to the time of *Reformation*. And here you say,

in the Roman Church, the Metropolitan swears obedience to the Pope; the Bishop to the Metropolitan; the Presbyter to the Bishop: So, in our Church, the same is now the same as ever, putting only a Prince in the room of the Pope, excepting the few alterations the Laws have made. You have not given us the Oath required of Priests in the Church of Rome. At these few Alterations are such as might perhaps have added more Light to this matter, than all your other Observations, if you had been pleased, or willing a little to insist upon them. The Bishop in the Church of Rome promises Obedience and Faithfulness to the Pope, without any limitation. In our Church he promises to the Metropolitan due Reverence and Obedience. And the Inferior Clergy, do not promise, or swear, that they will absolutely obey the Canons; but only, that they will obey their Bishop; and this only, in all just and honest Things; which two things were always heretofore required in two distinct Matters, when they were so intended. So that all you can say that the Archbishop takes an Oath of Fidelity to the King; the Bishop to the

Arch-



Archbishop; and the *Presbyter* swears to yield *Canonical Obedience* to his *Bishop*, all such Things as he himself judges to be *lawful*. And where is the Crime of Slavery of this, even to those who acknowledge *Episcopal Government* bare and lawful? The *conclusion* you draw from your *Historical Account* is this, If the *Oath* of Obedience to the *Bishop*, ever refer'd to the *Canons*, it must do so still. I deny the *Consequence*. It might only refer to the *Canons*; and yet be altered now, so as not to do so. And granting the consequence, I deny, that your *Account* hath made it, in the least, probable that it ever refer'd to the *Canons*; rather the contrary, that it relates to something that was ever accounted distinct from *Obedience* to the *Canons*. And granting that it doth refer to the *Canons*, you must make it a very insignificant Security to the *Church*, whilst you acknowledge that it refers not to the *Canons* enforced by the *Bishop*. And your *Canon of Scotland* (p. 336.) is far from making it evident, that the *Oath* ever did, or doth now, refer to the *Canons*; that it makes the contrary highly probable. By it, all

are required to subscribe, to be obedient to the *Canons of the Church*. Now how can it be evident from hence, that a promise of Canonical Obedience to a particular Bishop, limited only to lawful Things, is a promise of unlimited Obedience to the *Canons*? For if it prove any thing to your purpose, it must prove this. Is it not rather plain from hence, that where a promise of Obedience to the *Canons* is required, it is made distinct from a promise of Obedience to the *Bishop*, and always enjoyed to be made in plain words, not capable of any other Interpretation? But I cannot but observe to the Reader, that here is an *History* pompously introduced; and styl'd in our Contents, *An Historical Account of an Oath, since its entrance into the Church*: and in this History, there is not produced so much as the *Form of an Oath of Canonical Obedience* to a particular Bishop, impos'd upon *Presbyters*, except after the *Reformation*; nothing alleged but that, as *Usurpation* came on, the *Clergy* were in some Places required to subscribe to an unlimited Obedience to the *Canons*, and in others had it insisted upon them; and an Affirmation

on at last, that the *Bishops* in the Church of *Rome*, do now bind their *Clergy* them in an *Oath*, but what sort of *Oath* we are not informed. Now how can any thing of all this prove, that the *Oath*, in which you must acknowledge the express mention of *Obedience* to the *Canons* is avoided, was designed to oblige to that *Obedience*; or that our *Oath* now imposed, is the very same, and of the same purport, with that in the Church of *Rome*; or that an *Oath* of *Obedience* to a particular *Bishop*, limited only to *lawful Things*, is an *Oath* of *Obedience* to the *Canons*? Nay, I am ready to shew, that you your self, in your own Interpretation of it, make it entirely different from any *Precedent* alleged in this Piece of *History*: And, therefore, that it is *absurd* to call an *Historical Account* of the *Oath* now required, even upon your own *Concessions*.

In one word, Whoever will bestow the pains to look into what I have heretofore, and now, written on the *Head*, will find, that you have avoided speaking to many material *Observations* that you say nothing to the *Object* which I made against the Interpretation of

*Eye*

Ejected Ministers; that the whole of what you have said, excepting your piece of *History*, is founded upon your mistaking my *Interpretation*; and that your *History*, if it prove any thing, proves the direct contrary to what you would fix upon this *Oath of Canonical Obedience*.

But I must consider those *Canons*, which you have here alleged to prove your Point: for, tho' I do still maintain, that the *Oath of Canonical Obedience* to the *Bishop*, doth not imply it in any *Absolute Obedience*, but leaves a liberty of demurring upon any of his Commands, of what Nature soever; yet I still likewise maintain, That a *Minister* is obliged, as he professes himself a *Minister* in this *Church*, to satisfy himself about the *Canons* now in force, and to be ready to obey them, according to the true intent of them. Now, as for the *Excommunicating Canon*, as you mention, I say, they are not in force, that it is, in the least degrees, probable, That a *Minister* will be called to join in the *Execution* of them: And, therefore, are not such as present *Minister* is concerned in. And tho',

K



## A Defence of the

tho', as you observe, an *Act of Toleration* can take away no *Rights* of the *Church*; yet an *Act of Toleration* can hinder the *Execution* of all such *Canons*, and remove the fear of ever being called upon to execute them. But after all, I do not plainly see, that these *Canons* did ever respect the Behaviour of *Ministers* at all, but only directed others about *Excommunications*: Or, that the *Minister* had ever any part in the matter, unless it were, that he might be called upon to declare a *Matter of Fact*.

And to say that these *Canons* may possibly be revived, is to say nothing in which the present *Ministers* are concerned: And you may as well say, supposing there are no obnoxious *Canons* now, yet there may be in time to come.

The next *Canon* respects *Kneeling at the Communion*: And for the lawfulness of Obedience to it, I refer to my *Answer* to your *Introduction*; in which I doubt not, I shall prove the lawfulness of it, at least, upon your former Principles.

The Canon about the refusing Communicants coming from other Parishes, tho' the Observation of it may be recommended for its Usefulness, on many Accounts; yet is apparently, and professedly neglected, with the Knowledge and Connivence of our Superiors; and that by the most regular, and excellent Persons in their *Dioceses*. And, therefore concerns us not.

For the lawfulness of complying with the Imposition of the Surplice, in which Compliance only, a Minister is concerned, I refer to my Answer to your Introduction.

The Canon that requires Ministers to Baptize all Children, &c. doth not intend all Children without Exception: But ought, by all the Rules of Equity in the World, to be interpreted only with respect to a Country, in which all Parents are supposed to be, by Profession, Christians. And you have offered no Argument, as I know of, to make it so much as *probable*, that that Profession is not a sufficient Title, or that Children are to suffer in their Spiritual Concerns for the Sins of their Parents; or that it is not *lawful* to

K 2

Baptize

## A Defence of the

Baptize all *Children* that are, in the least, likely to be offered to *Baptism*, amongst us, upon the *Terms* required in our *Church*.

To pay Obedience to the *Canon* that forbids *Private Fast*s, in its true, and full intent, you must acknowledge to be *lawful*: But, at present, there is not the least occasion to enquire whether it be or no. And it is *lawful*, undoubtedly, to pay Obedience to that *Canon*, which enjoins the *Minister* to exhibit the Names of his *Parishioners*, who neglect the Communion. But were it not; the Universal Neglect of it, as far as to prevent all probability of your supposed evil Consequences is sufficient to bear out any *Minister* in the *Established Church*.

Thus much for your *first Reason* against the *Oath* of *Canonical Obedience* taken from your Interpretation of it, which makes it, not an *Oath* of Obedience to such *Injunctions* of a particular *Bishop*, as we think *Lawful*; but an *Oath* of Obedience to the *Canons*. And here, I think, I have once more shewn that it cannot be so Interpreted, with

out contradicting the very *Design*, and *Words* of it.

Your *Second Reason* against it was taken from the management of the *Episcopal Government by Chancellors, &c.* Which, in many Instances, I as heartily lament, as you can *expose* it. But I see not yet how it touches this *Oath*. For if I swear to pay Obedience to one *Person* only; and in all *lawful Things* only: This *Oath* obliges me to regard nothing but the Will of this particular *Person*, and requires me to examine all his Injunctions, whether they be *lawful* or not. And you acknowledge here, that the *Oath* cannot bind to Things *Unlawful*: But yet, if it do but seem to bind to Things *Unlawful*, you intimate that it is *Unlawful*. And this more than once: which is very hard indeed, that in Things wherein we are agreed, that an *Oath* cannot bind, it should yet seem to bind; and that *the seeming* to bind, so it be certain it cannot bind, should be sufficient to prove it *Unlawful*. But now can an *Oath* of Obedience to any *Person*, limited expressly to Things *lawful*,



*ful, so much as seem to bind to things Unlawful?*

Give me leave here to say again, that it imports little to number up the possible Inconveniences a Minister in the *Established Church* may Suffer; for that belongs not to the *Question* about the *lawfulness* of Conformity. There may be Inconveniences attending the doing our Duty: But, as much as you would make your Reader believe the contrary, they are so rare, that I profess I know not my self, in all my Acquaintance, a single Instance of them. And I suppose, you are not without your *Temporal Inconveniences* in your own way. But how it can be called *acting blindfold*, to resolve to do our Duty and to be obedient in all *lawful Things*, tho' we meet with Inconveniences in our way, I cannot see. You cannot say that a Minister in the *Established Church* is absolutely bound by the Decrees of others: And if you mean only, that he is so bound, as to obey them, when he knows they are the *Injunctions* of his *Bishop*, and is satisfied that they are agreeable to the *Laws of Christ*; who are not ashamed of such Ties and Obligations.

ligations. For this is such an Obligation, as no Reasonable Creature need be ashamed of: It is both becoming, and justifiable: It is neither putting out, nor shutting our Eyes. But I leave you, once more, to justify such Representations of this matter, to God, and your own Conscience: And am very much pleased to find, upon this re-examination of the Terms of Ministerial Conformity, that I have so little Reason to repent of my own Engagements; or to envy Your so much boasted Liberty.

FINIS.

K 4

A

## A Reply to the Postscript to the Second Part of Your Defence

SIR

**T**He first Part of your *Defence of Moderate Nonconformity* gave me a just occasion, as I thought then, and still continue to think, of representing to You, and to the World, some Observations about your *Method of Controversy*: And your *Reply* to that Representation gives me occasion of considering again, whether I had not Reason to do so. Especially, since you are pleased to thank me for the Pains I have already taken with you, and the occasion have this way given you to Elucidate some matters which needed farther clearing; am the more enclined to Merit your thanks once more, and to give you another occasion to Elucidate some Matters which still need farther clearing.

When I made that *Representation* to You, it was purely out of a design to render our manner of Writing as inoffensive, and as Useful as possible to the Christian World; to set a Mark upon such things, as might prove Scandalous to *Religion*, or Stumbling-blocks in the way of *Truth*, that so we might carefully, and conscientiously avoid them; and to engage You to make such *separation*, as becomes a Christian, for those hard *Representations*, I thought, I had too apparent Reason to complain of. But I am sorry to find that my *Protests* had so little influence upon You, to make it necessary for me to trouble You again, in order both to vindicate my self to the World, and to convince You that I had good Reason to address my Self to You.

I am not indeed ignorant, that I have been said that many of those things which I made the Subject of my *Complaints* to You, are small Matters, and of too little Importance to deserve any Concern, or notice. But they who say this, surely do not consider, how great a Fire these little sparks often kindle. Every one who hath made



made any Observations upon Human Nature, must own, that how *little* so ever *these* things be in themselves, it from *these*, and the like, that the generality of Men receive their strongest Impressions; that these are the things that prejudice their minds; that rain Clouds of Passion before their Eyes and draw their thoughts aside from the main Point. Nay, I am perswaded, that there is nothing in *Controversy* but *they little* Matters, as they are called, that hath given occasion, either to the complaints of good Men, or to the reproaches of the Wicked. And therefore I hope I shall be Pardon'd, if I can not yet perswade my self to think lightly of them, as not to use my utmost Endeavours to put a Stop to the use of them, by shewing the unreasonableness, and bad influence, of them. And, here, could I but obtain the favour of all *Readers*, to lay my last *Paper* before them, and to go over your *Reply* every Part of it; they would easily perceive what Reason I have still to apply my self to you; and your very Friends, I doubt not, would acknowledge the Truth of what your Self has

## To the Postscript, &c.

139

Postsc.  
p. 366.

said of your Reply, that it is rather a  
Specimen of what might be said, than a  
distinct return to Particulars; and that  
on some (or rather all) of them, You do,  
indeed, touch but lightly: But whether  
for fear of breaking in upon my Temper,  
as You say, or for some other Reason,  
I must leave to others to judge from  
your former behaviour towards me.

The first Observation I made, was,  
that great Part of Your Defence was taken  
in what is of no relation to the Cause be-  
tween us: And that many things were  
brought into it, which might help to ob-  
scure the Controversy, and prejudice Men  
against the Establisht Church.

Under this Head, I instanced, first,  
the two Sentences prefixed to Your De-  
claration, which could have no Relation, to  
your Book, nor to the Title of it: the  
one of which Insinuates into your Rea-  
der's mind, that the Persons whom You  
suppose, are Sensible of no Necessity of any  
thing to recommend the Establisht Church,  
loud Cries of it's Perfections, and Excel-  
lence, &c. And the other of them, I ob-  
served, very plainly intimates to your  
readers, that if Conformists be not con-  
vinced by your Arguments, of the good-  
ness

Admon.  
p. 9.

p. 19.

*ness of your Cause, it is to be attributed to the worldly Advantages that attend Conformity. This, in my opinion, is very well worthy of a Christian's Consideration; and it would have become you either to have shewn, that such Insinuations are consistent with *Common Justice*, and *Christian Charity*; or fairly to have retracted them. But this was a tender Point, and *but lightly* to be touched upon: And therefore, all the Answer we are to receive is this, that I shewed You the Example; and that, I hope, You have not Wrested, or Misapplied the Passages cited.*

Ref.  
p. 367.

If I shewed You the Example, I am heartily sorry for it: But can never Believe that my Example could have such an influence upon you, as to induce you to be guilty of a very bad Practice. But whether I did or not, let every Reader of common Sense judge. Had I applied Mr. Baxter's Sayings with Reference to the Sectaries to all the Nonconformists; or put the so as to tempt others to make the Application; as You say I have: Yet this has been nothing comparable to your Insinuations just now mentioned; the being nothing in them like an Intimation that any thing of a Temporal Consideration

## To the Postscript, &c.

141

*in the Reason of your want of Conviction:* which is a Reflexion that touches Men in the tenderest Point, their *Conscience and Honesty*. You, as well as many others of your Brethren, are not so Free from *Temporal Encouragements*, but that there may be place for the same Reflexion, did not *Justice and Charity*, direct me to other Returns: but yet you would do well to think with what Remnants You your Selves should receive such *Insinuations*. But, as to the Example I set You, I see no Reason, upon the Review, to be ashamed of it: for can you find any Resemblance to in the Return you have made. For the Case, which you seem not rightly apprehend, stands thus. You know my design was to Reply to your Book, in which I found many unnecessary Aggravations of the Cause of *Conformity* in several Respects; (as I have shewn at large, as I passed; and many of them I do) You will not your self wholly dejected to make you Sensible of the Unreasonableness, and evil Consequences such *Representations*; and to give satisfaction to such of You, as Acknowledge *Communion* with our Church, to be *essentially Lawfull*, and yet *Separate* from it.



it. Now what could be more Applicable to this Design, than those Words out of Mr. Baxter, which I prefixed before the first part of my Answer? or what could I have thought of more proper on such an occasion, than put You in mind, that it was Mr. Baxter's Judgment, that all those miserable Subdivisions, and fatal Effects of them in the troublesome Times (which he Represents in most lively Colours) were owing Originally to *Unwarrantable Separations, and too much Aggravation of the Terms, and Circumstances of Conformity*? Could I have thought of anything more likely to move you to consider in what Evils such a *Separation* and such *Representations*, are likely to end, I would have offered it to your thoughts, instead of this. What Mr. Baxter at that time meant by *Unwarrantable Separation*, is, I think, plain from what follows about the *Separation*, viz. that their great Errour was, that because the Constitution of the Church needed *Amendment, it required their obstinate Separation*. From whence it is very plain, that the Words I quote are exactly Applicable to those who

te from the Church of England, be-  
 cause it needs Amendment; and to all  
 who have any hand in beginning, or  
 continuing, *unnecessary Aggravations* of  
 the Terms of Conformity: And to such  
 only I applied it. If these Words of  
 Mr. Baxter be exactly applicable to the  
 Persons with whom I was concern'd,  
 and the Book which I had undertaken  
 to consider; and if it be perfectly recon-  
 cilable with *Justice* and *Charity*, (to  
 put you in mind of the sad Confe-  
 sences that have been known to fol-  
 low from *Unwarrantable Separations*, and  
*unnecessary Aggravations* (which is all  
 that this Sentence pretends to;) with  
 that Justice can you say that *I set you*  
*the Pattern*? Or, how can this justify  
 you in your Insinuations, that the Con-  
 fessions are by their Sins pulling down  
 God's Judgments, whilst they are crying up  
 the Perfection of their Church; and that  
 they be not convinced of the goodness  
 of your Cause, it is to be attributed to the  
 temporal Advantages annexed to Con-  
 formity. Neither of which can, even  
 to your self, be applied to the Cause  
 you have in hand, or to the Persons  
 whose Books you replied: And  
 one

one of which you can never prove to be consistent with *Truth*, or *Charity*.

The *other* Sentence I thought more proper to prefix to my *Second* Part, which I consider your Arguments, for *Separation* from a *Church* whose *Communion* you acknowledge to be *materially Lawfull*; and in which I take occasion so to speak of the Reasonings of *others* who are unwilling to make any *Alterations*, in what they apprehend to be perfect, or excellent *Scheme*, for the sake of Peace. And the meaning of it being only this, that the *Peace* of the *Christian* World ought to be preferred before the perfection of a *church* about which there are such different Opinions. I could think nothing more inoffensive than to put You in mind of this in *Baxter's* own Words: Which, if they were true when He spake them, certainly are so still, and will remain so for ever. And as they carry along with them an Obligation upon all *others*, well as *You*, to regard the *Peace* of *Christians*, I should have thought they might have been rather Agreeable, than displeasing to You. Much less could

think that because I put you in mind that *Public Peace* is to be regarded before our private particular Schemes; therefore You should be led to give such Insinuations to the World, about the Integrity, and Consciences, of the *Conformists*. And from what I have now laid before You, let your own Friends judge, whether You can defend your Self, in this Instance, from *my Example*, who have never made one single Reflexion, as I know of, either in Mr. Baxter's Words, or any other, upon the *Morals*, or *Honesty*, of any amongst You.

But I wonder that, when You were urging my own Example against me, You did not think fit to plead, in Excuse for your Self, the Temptation which, in another place, You tell the World, I said in your way, to a *practice of this Nature*. For, methinks, You might here very naturally have brought in what You there Allege against me; viz. that To Represent those Learned Men, who opposed Episcopacy at the beginning of the Reformation, as imagining themselves under an unhappy necessity to contradict and obscure a plain Truth, is on-  
ly



ly to tempt those who adhere to them, in their turn, to represent the zealous Patrons of the Hierarchy, as unhappily Biass'd by the too prevailing motive of Interest. Now, that no one may think I have given You any Provocation, to Return any thing of this Nature, or to Censure the Integrity of your Brethren, I desire that You your Self would turn to that place in my Book you refer to, and see if you have not Reason to retract this Representation of my Sense. The Truth there mentioned is, that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, have been in the Church from the Apostles Days: And what I plainly say is, that *This Truth hath been very much cleared since the Reformation; and the unhappy necessity some Learned Men imagined themselves under to contradict and obscure it, hath helped mightily to the clearing it.* These are my Words. I do not so much as say, that it was a plain Truth, before these Learned Men had contradicted it, and given occasion to the Enquiries of other Learned Men about it. Much less do I say that they contradicted what they thought a plain Truth; or that they were led by Interest, or worldly views

tives to oppose it; or any thing like this. They might *Imagine themselves under a necessity to contradict it*, from the best Motives in the World, for the sake of the Honour of God, and of the Gospel, notwithstanding any thing I have said; as I believe many of them did. But surely it is no harm to say, that it was *Unhappy* they were in this Error; or any Temptation to You, to call in question your *Brethren's Integrity*, to say, that some very *Learned Men*, by contradicting a Truth, gave occasion to the clearing of it; which is all I say, without the least Reflexion upon their *Honesty*, and *Integrity*.

As for your other *Plea*; if you have introduced these *two Sentences*, where they are not of the least concern; and so, as that *they are left to be applied to a Cause*, to which they signify nothing, and to *Persons* of whom *Justice*, and *Charity* would direct You to speak otherwise; then, I think it most evident, that You *have wrested, and misapplied them*. And, therefore, I heartily wish You would think of some better Defence, or else retract these hard, and indecent Insinuations.

L 2

My

My Second Instance is, *Your being Solicitous to draw in unnecessary Aggravations into the Cause.* The Answer to this, without one Word of the particulars mentioned, is, that *in this neither Mr. Ollyffe, nor Mr. Hoadly fall short of You.* Of this, as You say, *Standers-by will judge, as they see Cause*; and too often, You know, as Affection, and Prejudice move them; and, therefore, You should not have directed them to judge so of us, till they found Cause. The particulars I Instanced in, will help them to judge, whether they can find any thing parallel in my Books. Two of them I shall here repeat, because it can be found that I have *not come short of you* in them, I shall heartily repent of it, and readily Retract it. The one is, *Your Reflexion upon the Church for the Ill-manners, and Ingratitude of some of her Profelytes*; and the other is, *Your frequent and severe Censures past upon many of the Conforming Clergy.* But if You your self, after all your Endeavours have not been able to produce any thing like this, nor indeed any one *unnecessary Aggravation* out of my Writing (as I shall shew, by and by, You have

not) I have no reason to think, that *Standers-by* will examine them, with less Candour, or more Severity, than You have.

My Third, Instance is, Your talking so often of *Catholick Christianity*, and *Union upon Scripture Terms, &c.* But my Reason for mentioning this, You have not plainly given your Reader; which was, because in this You forsake the *Elected Ministers*, and Mr. Baxter (as well as the *Independents*) whose Cause You professed to maintain, and in whose Foot-steps You profess to tread. And accordingly I told You, that You must be ready, upon their Principles, to Conform tho' there be such Terms in the Establishment, as will exclude some Christians. And consequently, your talk of *Catholick Christianity, &c.* carries no good Argument in it, against Conformity, which is all that I was concerned about. To this you Answer, that You cannot say that you desire a *National Establishment with Unscriptural Additions*: as if I had said, that You were obliged to desire a *National Establishment with Unscriptural Additions*. I say, if you be not ready to Comply upon their Principles,



ciples, You have forsaken their Principles, and are not a Follower of them: And therefore, I only requested, that You would distinguish plainly, what it is You dislike in them, and what You follow; that You would not Profess Your self an Espouser of the same Cause with Them, whilst You agree indeed little in *Separation* from the Church, but differ in one of their most material Principles of Action. I thought, that I might have said of Yourself, that You would have complied with the *constant* Use of the *Liturgy* as recommended: Whereas I find since that You would not be thought too ready to do this. But in your very last Performance (which gives us, I presume your last Thoughts) if I mistake not You give us leave to think, that You would Comply, tho' required to come under an Obligation of using the *Liturgy* sometimes. Now this very Term will *Exclude some Christians*, from the Established Church, as much as they are now Excluded, and is an *Unscriptural Addition*. So that still I may say that your frequent mention of *Catholic Christianity*, and *Union upon Scriptural Terms*

## To the Postscript, &c.

151

*Terms* signifies nothing; because You *your Self* sometimes professes that you are ready to Comply, even upon Terms which are not *Scripture Terms* in your own Sense of the Words, *i. e.* as you explain your Self here (p. 369) tho' *Those things be not left free, the determining which, one way or other, is not, in Scripture, at all directed: And tho' something be made necessary to Communion, which is there left absolutely indifferent.* I might well, therefore, take notice of the frequent use of such Phrases, and Expressions, as lead people to think, that the *Ejected Ministers*, and those who profess to follow them, are resolved against *Compliance*, till every thing Unnecessary, and Unscriptural, be left free, and undetermined; when at the same time, they have very plainly, as I thought, declared, and implied, that they were ready to Comply upon other Terms. But to intimate as You do, that a *Compliance in Lawful things for the sake of Peace*, is not an Union upon *Scripture Terms*, will be very strange to all who consider the value that is set upon Peace, in Holy Scripture; and who will due notice of that very Maxim of St.

Paul,

L 4

## A Reply

Paul, which you produce against it, viz. *All things are Lawful for me, but all things are not Expedient*: which I shall have occasion, in another place, to consider, and explain from the practice of the Apostle himself; viz. When I offer to the World a full Examination of that Scheme which you have at last pitch'd upon, as far as I am concerned in it. But I wish you would tell us plainly, whether you be resolved against Compliance, as long as any of those you call *Unscriptural Additions* are left in the Constitution, or not; because if you be not, then the Truth, and Reasonableness, of your Scheme, is no Argument against Conformity; and if you be, then there is an end of all our attempts towards Union: unless you can think it an easy, and pardonable matter, to wish for the Dissolution of such an *Establishment*, as the present is, at a venture. Nay, should the present Constitution be Dissolved, I may confidently affirm, that, let who will be at the Helm; let a *Parliament* be called of what *Persons* you please; let an *Assembly* be gathered of what *Divines*

gives Your Selves should name; there can never be the least ground to hope for the *Establishment* of your particular Scheme, or a *Constitution* without *Unscriptural Additions*. We may project, and wish, what we please: But I say again, that the true *Union upon Scripture-Terms*, and the only *Union* we can have any Reason to hope for, must be founded upon a *Mutual Compliance in Lawful things, for the sake of Peace, and for the promotion of Charity*.

As for the many Pages of your *Defence*, that are of no concern to me, which was the fourth Instance I gave; You say, that tho' they be not of concern to me, yet they are to the Question you proposed, viz. *Whether moderate Nonconformity to the present Establishment be justifiable*. Now, whatever you would have your Readers believe, this is the very same Question that I am pursuing: And therefore, if you can shew that these Pages are of concern to *this*, I will acknowledge, that they are of concern to me also, and that I was quite mistaken, when I apprehended that they were not. And the main Point here being, whether the *Historical Accounts*, which you



you have communicated to the World can in the least contribute to the Determining this Question; nay, whether such Accounts, on all sides, do not tend to the opening our Wounds afresh, and reviving our mutual Hatred: Give me leave, to go over some of these Pieces of History; and permit me to ask a clear, and distinct *Answer* to the following *Questions*. Is it necessary for every one, who Conforms to the present Establishment, to understand, or know, any one of the Histories you have Represented to the World? Or Is it not sufficient for all Persons to examine, and consider, the Terms, at present, required of them in order to *Conformity*? If this be sufficient, as the World must own it to be, then can not any of these *Historical Accounts* be of any concern to the *Question*, as you self propose it. Doth it follow that because your *Account of High-Church* and *Low-Church*, is true; therefore You ought not in Conscience, to Conform to the *present Establishment*? Doth it follow, that, because your *Fore-fathers* were Injured, and Abused, therefore *Nonconformity* is Justifiable? And, com

come to your last Performance, doth follow, that, because the *Subscription* was rigorously Imposed, heretofore, by some *Bishops*, and accounted a great difficulty by some *Presbyters*; therefore *Nonconformity* is *justifiable*? And, supposing it made certain by your *History*. *Account*, whereas, in Truth, it is not so much as made probable by it, that the *Oath of Canonical Obedience* to the *Bishop* in all *lawful things*, is not so much an *Oath* to a particular *Bishop*, as an *Obligation* to obey all the *Canons* now in force, without any *Limitation*; so that it follow from hence, that, therefore, *Nonconformity*, and *Separate Assemblies* for the *Worship* of God, are *justifiable*? If this do not follow from any of these things, or from all put together; then these Pieces of *History*, tho' they may delight some *Tempers*, yet can be of no concern to your *Question*, unless it be to draw the *Affections* of Men to one side; and to move their *Pas- sions*, where they ought, indeed, to be guided only by the purest Reason. The reason, therefore, of my taking notice of the many *Pages* of no concern to the cause between us, plainly appears to be this,

this, because they are such as tend to incline Mens minds to one side, without carrying so much as the shadow of an Argument along with them; and some of them, not only to prejudice the Minds of your own Party, and incite them against the *Church*; but to exasperate the *Conformists*, and induce them to return you like for like; and so to revive *mutual Jealousies*, when one would think it time for all good Men to forget what is past, and to press forward towards *Concord*, and *Unity*, for the time to come. And need I be ashamed of this? or, beg Pardon, for expressing such Desires, and Inclinations? I shall only add, that, supposing your *Rights* invaded; (as you would here persuade the World in too Tragical Language for me to repeat;) these *Historical Illustrations* neither prove that your *Original Rights* are what you pretend; nor granting that, do they prove that it is not your Duty to recede from the *Rights*, for the sake of a greater good to the *Christian Church*: And, consequently, are of no concern to the *Quest* on you pursue.

I now judge it expedient to con-

consider, and examine Your *Dissertation* concerning the *Authority* of the *Fathers*. But I thought I might have the Liberty of Remarking that I was under no Obligation to regard it; because, supposing the truth of all that is there alleged, it serves not, in the least, to justify the Nonconformity of such as hold *Episcopal Government, and Episcopal Ordination*, to be Lawful, and Valid. And I think it highly desirable, on all hands, that, when *Writers* think fit to insert such *Dissertations*, and such Pieces of *History*, they should not be so managed, as to seem, to unwary *Readers*, of the Essence of the *Controversy*; but notice should plainly given, that they are *Digressions*, and that they are to take care not to judge of the Merits of the *Cause*, from any thing contained in them. And now, I leave it to others to determine, what Reason You have to say, that You are *Sufficiently clear'd your self from my first Capital Charge*: And proceed to your Vindication of your self from The Second, under which I took notice to the World, of your Unhandsome treatment of my Self; your unkind *Censures*;



*ures; and your Misrepresentations of my design, and my manner of Writing.*

The first Instance here, is your frequent Censures upon me for want of Charity, only because, it is my Opinion that God doth not approve of your Separation, and, consequently, neither your Ordination, and Publick Ministry. And in this, you think fit to persist: Whilst, at the same time, you grant to me, that it is *not* a part of Christian Charity, to approve of all the Actions of Honest, and Understanding Men. How then can it be want of Charity, to approve of your Ordinations? Without notwithstanding, You say, *It is unhappy a Man to imbibe such Principles as tend to cramp his Charity.* But, Sir, the Question is not, what You, or I, count unhappy; but what it is that deserves the happy name of *Uncharitable*: Nor was it the matter of my Complaint, that it was your Opinion that *my Principles tended to cramp my Charity* (as you have here turn'd it, p. 374.) Nor was this the thing I reamiss, that you wis'd my Charitable Temper might, by it's prevalence, put me upon close Re-examining my Principles, from whence Uncharitable conclusions, you sa

*naturally follow*: as you are pleased with that softness to turn it, p. 377. tho' you still declare your self against all Extractions. These were things I should never have taken notice of. What I blamed in you, was vastly different from any thing of this nature, viz. that you charged me expressly, with want of *Charity*, only because I was unable to perswade my self that God approved of your neglect of *Episcopal Ordination*, and *Separation* from our Church.

And farther, let me put you in mind, that my *Principles* tend no more to *ump my Charity* towards you; than any other difference in opinion doth; no more, than your not approving of many things in the Church, tends to *cramp* your *Charity* towards Us. But, in my poor judgment, our *Charity* may remain unaffected by our difference of Opinion. And I wish you would consider more, whether there be any single instance of *Charity* required by the *Gospel*, which I may not be able, and ready, to shew you; even whilst I cannot approve of your *Ordination*. For, if you cannot name one, this will pass for a De-

a Demonstration with all who understand any thing, that you do me, and your self, a great injury in persisting in this *Charge*; and that you have Reason to think that my *Principles* cramp and confine my *Charity*. But you say, *I disown a number of Ministers who are Excellently qualified, and want nothing required in Scripture, for want of*

p. 372. *nicety, &c.* That is, in my own way speaking, I am so persuaded of the sufficiency of the Means of Salvation the *Established Church*, that I cannot apprehend the least necessity for a *Separation* from it, which always brings along with it miserable consequences to the Honour, and Interest of *Christianity* and, therefore, cannot but judge them to be in an Error who think otherwise and cannot think that God approves their Error; or that it is his Will, that should set up *Separate Assemblies*, and *Ordinations* opposite to that which is ready fixed, and which is sufficient to good purposes. This is the true State of the Case. I speak not of any Person's Condemnation at the last day. For that I am always led to place entirely upon the want of *Honesty*, and *Modesty*.

grity: Nor was it merely your *Ordination* by *Presbyters*, that I disapproved, (as you would have your *Readers* believe, p. 375.) but your Ordination by *Presbyters*, in opposition to a *Lawful Establishment*, and without any necessity, as I think, for your *Publick Ministrations*. And is this any greater a Crime, than the thinking you in an Error? (a Liberty which I easily grant you to take with my self;) and can this be *want of Charity* any more in *Me*, than in *You*? Can this be the least Provocation to a Person of your Freedom? And if you think me in an Error, cannot you tell me so, without declaring me deficient in one of the most important, and most divine Virtues of *Christianity*?

All the World might see from the whole Tenor of my Discourse, that, when I said that *Charity bath nothing to do in our Enquiries after Truth*, my whole Meaning was, that tho' we have never so much *Charity* to Men's Persons, and never so great an Inclination to acquit them (as indeed, I have, to acquit all Men) yet this must not influence us so as to judge favourably of them, against what appears to us to be *Truth*, and

M

Reason.



*Reason.* And I am sorry to find, that you have so little Inclination to understand any Thing that I advance, as to spend your Time here in arguing against me, as if I thought it not requisite to come to the search after Truth, inclined to make allowance for any such Diversity in Sentiment, or Practice, as is consistent with a cordial Love to God, and Man; or, as if I had said, that Charity ought not to turn the Scale on the favourable side, where the Matter is doubtful, or ought not to dispose us to accept of a moderate Over-weight on that side. And I am much more sorry to find, that you can think it worth your while, and pardonable in your self, to represent me here as laying such a stress upon Ecclesiastical Custom, as to nullify your Ministry, and your Churches; as holding Episcopal Ordination so necessary, as that no other is valid; as laying such a stress upon the Episcopal Character, as to reject the Ministrations of those whose Orders were not confirmed by it as not acknowledging Persons ordained by Presbyters (tho' wanting in nothing required in Scripture) to be approved of God, & to represent me, I say, in this manner when you know that I have always declar

P. 374.

P. 375.

declared, that the chief Reason for my not approving your *Ordinations*, is my Apprehension, that your Separation from this Church is unnecessary, and accompanied with very many Evil Consequences; when I never once thought of nullifying your *Churches*, or which is the same Thing, making your *Administrations* invalid; when I never laid such a stress upon *Ecclesiastical Custom*, or the necessity of *Episcopal Ordination*, as to disapprove of *You* merely for the neglect of that; when I have openly, and frequently invited you to put the whole of your Cause, upon the *Necessity* of your Separation, and have professed freely, in so many Words, That if you could clearly make out that, I would acknowledge that God approved of your Ordinations; and lastly, when in my Enquiry into this Matter (as far as your Conduct is concerned) I am so far from running farther than *Scripture*, that the main Reason, why I cannot think God approves of your Conduct, is, because the *Scripture* it self leads me to think that you ought, for the sake of Peace and Charity, to Conform to a *Church*, and comply with an *Episcopacy*, which you think to be

be Lawful; and that God cannot approve of your neglecting the settled Ordination, and ministring in a Separation, which carries along with it many very sensible Mischiefs to his *Church*. I leave it to you to consider what Reason I have given you for such *Representations*, and to every indifferent Person to judge, whether you have *well* defended your charging me with *want* of *Charity*, by fixing on me other Things as distant from my Thoughts, as they are from your own.

P. 376.

And now, how your Principles can leave room for a *more extensive Charity*, than mine do, I cannot well imagine: since you your self have acknowledged that it is no part of *Charity*, to think Men in the right; and consequently, no *want* of *Charity* to think good Men in an Error, as you your self scruple not to do. And since every Body must evidently perceive, that there is no instance of *Christian Charity* towards You, which may not be perfectly disposed, and ready to perform, whilst I am led by the best Light I can find, to disapprove of your *Separation* and *Ordinations*. But here you take notice of what I observe

of your Self, that You exceed me not much in this *Catholick Spirit*; and that if it be want of *Charity* to be of Opinion that God cannot approve of the Publick Ministrations of some Men, your self must come under the same Imputation. And I thought I had Reason to say so from many *Passages* in your *former Book*, which seemed to me plainly to imply that you could not think that God approves the *Ministrations* of those who, without any Necessity, are set apart to the *Ministry* without any *Ecclesiastical Officer*; and wholly neglect a *Ministerial Investiture*. But I find now, that you dare not *Censure* such as these, as not call'd to be *Ministers*, if you find their *Ministrations* to have good Effects, in the Conversion of any Persons to *serious Religion*. Here, therefore, you would represent me, as having mistaken your Sense: For you speak, as if this had been always your Opinion, and not, as if you had altered your Mind in this particular. But let any one judge, whether it be possible for you, even upon your own Principles, and Concessions, to extricate your self, without fairly acknowledging, that your Mind is



altered since you last wrote. Nay, let us see, what you say, in this very Place, and in your last Performance. You own that God doth not approve *Irregular Ordinations*; and in this very Page, you define *Irregular Ordinations* to be such as the *Scriptures* do not *Warrant*. Now you your self acknowledge, that God approves of our *Ordinations*; and therefore, that they are *Regular*; and therefore, that they are such as the *Scriptures* *Warrant*. And, indeed, the Reason why I could not perfwade my self that God approves of your *Ordinations*; is because they are a Deviation from a settled Method, *Lawful* in your own Judgments, without a necessity for such Deviation; and such as, upon these Accounts, the *Scriptures* do not *Warrant*. Not merely because they are not exactly agreeable to the most prevailing *Ecclesiastical Custom*; as you constantly, without the least Ground, and to the wonder of all who ever Read my Books, represent my Opinion. But, to return; you say God doth not approve of *Irregular Ordinations*: And these are such as the *Scriptures* do not *Warrant*. You say, in the very Page, that for your own Part,

are clear, as to a Ministerial Investiture, that this is necessary to a Regular Ordination in the Sense of Scripture. From whence it follows, by a most natural, and necessary Consequence, that you are clearly of Opinion, for your own Part, that Ordinations without a Ministerial Investiture, are Irregular, such as the Scriptures do not Warrant, and, therefore, such as God doth not approve of. And this is all that I ever laid to your Charge, which is the very same Instance of that Want of Charity which you make me guilty of, in saying, That it is my Opinion, that God doth not approve of your forsaking Episcopal Ordination, without a necessity, because the Scriptures do not Warrant such a Neglect. But you say, p. 376. since it may admit of a fair Debate, what is necessary to a Regular Ordination in the Sense of Scripture; this makes you free to make Allowance, &c. But, let it admit, never so much, of a Debate, amongst others, you tell us in the next Words, That you, for your Part, are clear, as to a Ministerial Investiture; and consequently, that Ordinations without it are not warranted by Scripture; and, therefore, by your own Concession, not ap-

*proved by God.* This, I said, was your Opinion, and here you have confirmed what I said: And I thought it an indubitable Maxim, that we were obliged, in Conscience, to disapprove what, it is our Opinion, God himself disapproves, and to condemn, what, it is our Opinion, the *Scriptures* do not *Warrant*. But tho' this be so plainly your Opinion; yet, it seems, *You dare not Censure* any Persons, so far as plainly to declare this, without Reserve: But still would have the World believe, that tho' it be your Opinion, that *Ordinations without a Ministerial Investiture, where it can be had, are not approved of God, as not being warranted in Scripture*; yet it is also your Opinion, That *such Ordinations* are often approved of God, and warranted in *Scripture*. I believe you, when you tell the World that *You had your late honest Neighbour Mr. Beerman, and perhaps many others, in your Thoughts, when you indulged your self in this Latitude*. But we should not let our *Regards to the Persons* of Men, influence us to forsake or contradict, our professed Opinions and Principles. But here, I would desire you, to observe, that as I never said

P. 377.

P. 403.

of the *Dissenting Ministers*, either that they wanted *Abilities*, or never had any *Success* in *Converting* wicked Persons, which may be observed to attend indifferently upon Men of all Sects in the World;) but only that I could not think that God could approve of their *Neglect* of *Episcopal Ordination*, without a necessity, or give them Authority to Minister in an unnecessary Separation from lawful Church: So what I affirmed concerning *You*, under this Head, was not, that you were obliged, by your Principles, to hold, that such Persons as we are speaking of, *have no Gifts*, *and were never owned by God*, as far as the Conversion of wicked Persons proves them to have been so; (or any Thing like this;) but that *You* were obliged, as well as *I*, to hold, that the *Ordinations* of such Persons, are *Irregular*, *not warranted by Scripture*, and *not approved by God*: And you have proved the Truth of this, your self, in the very Page, in which you would seem to defend your self from it. And again, in this same r. 405. look, you own the very Thing, which is fixed upon you, when you say, that you conclude from Scripture, the *Ministerial*



## A Reply

*sterial Agency to be requisite; and you add that you cannot approve of the Neglect of it. How far Success, the only Thing you mention in this Cause, can be an Argument that a Minister Acts by a Divine Commission, (which is the Point now before us;) belongs to another Place: But it may, methinks, very clearly appear from these two Remarks viz. that it may be found where the Divine Commission cannot be supposed even by your selves; and that it may and often is wanting, where the Divine Commission is acknowledged by you selves to be: So that the Presence of cannot demonstrate the Divine Commission of the Minister; nor the Absence it prove the want of a Divine Commission. And because you say, you are following Gamaliel's Counsel, (which you were so kind also as to recommend to me) with respect to such as neglected Ministerial Investiture, lest haply you found Fighting against God; give me leave to ask you, whether Gamaliel's Counsel were directed against such only endeavoured in a reasonable way to convince the Apostles, that they were mistaken; or against such, who were*

for inflicting temporal, and corporal, Punishments upon them, for the sake of their supposed Errors: Whether it be against this Counsel, or against any Rule in *Christianity*, to believe that some Persons, who think they have a *Divine Commission*, have not; and to endeavour calmly to Convince them of it: Whether, if *this* be against *Gamaliel's* Counsel, You have not acted as much against it, by declaring *Your* Opinion, just now laid down, against the neglect of *Ministrial Investiture*, as I have, by declaring *Mine*, against *Your* neglect of *Episcopal Ordination*.

Add to this, the following Passages out of the first part of your *Defence*. We desire no encouragement for unnecessary irregularities. And, if we cannot prove our Ordinations valid, in the Sense of Scripture, we desire no Quarter, p. 57. the meaning of which must be, that it is reasonable to deny the Approbation of God to such Ordinations as are not warranted by Scripture. Again, in stating what the Scripture requires, and what you meet with sufficient Hints of, in the sacred Canon, you mention this, That Persons who set them apart, be invest-

ed, themselves, with the Same Holy Office. And, you say, till it can be made appear we, in some of these Particulars, vary from the Rule of Scripture, we cannot but think that they run a great Hazard, who Censure our Ordinations as unwarrantable, p. 107. which Sentence, I thought, plainly implied, that you thought it but just to Censure the Ordinations of those, as unwarrantable, who vary from the Rule of Scripture in some of these Particulars. Once more, p. 195. Mr. Baxter's Opinion, you say, is, That God hath made Ecclesiastical Officers, the ordinary Authoritative Judges of this Question, who shall be Ministers. And you add, *We are fully of his Mind; it belongs to the Ministerial Office to ordain: And a little after follows, and therefore it (viz. a Ministerial Investiture) is not to be omitted, where there is Opportunity for it.* I thought a most necessary Consequence from all these Passages, that you must hold that God cannot approve of the Ordination of such as neglect what is plainly, in your Opinion, required in Scripture. But if you think it reasonable to embrace such Principles; and yet a Position of *Charity*, to contradict, and unde-

them again, I am sorry for it: But cannot yet believe it so, because I am persuaded *Reason*, and *Charity*, are perfectly consistent; and because I am sure, your free declaring your Judgment against such Neglects, (and without such Reserves as you have now added) may be a great Instance of *Charity*, as well as *Truth* and *Reason*; as it may proceed from a compassionate Desire of putting stop to what is of very ill Consequence to the *Church of Christ*. And as you have no Reason to think that my Declarations on this Head, proceeded from any other Root, (even supposing me in a Mistake) I wish you would consider how you can defend your imputing *that* to want of *Charity*, which might, for ought you can tell, have proceeded from nothing but *Charity* it self.

But you are not Content, under this Head, with continuing your Charge against me, and denying some of the plainest *Tenets* in your former Writings, rather than I should seem to understand you aright, or represent you fairly: But you Tax me with doing you an Injury in representing you as agreeing with



with Mr. Dodwell, in this one Principle *That the Benefit of Spiritual Administrations depends upon the Authority of Him that Administers*: And say, *You have great Reason to Resent this*. And this, doubt not, will stick upon me, among such as have a Respect for *You*, and your Cause; who will not believe but that *You* understand your own Principle better than *I* can do. How far your Opinion may be altered since your last Writing, I am not able to say: But must, in the necessary Vindication of my self, shew *You*, that there are *Clarations*, in express Words, in your former Writings, sufficient to prove the Truth of what I have here fixed upon *You*. Nay, you own, in this very Page, what comes so little short of what I said of *You*, that *He* must be very Nice, who can find any difference between them. For you say, *It is your firm Perswasion, that there is little Reason to suspect that God should own those whom he hath not sent*: That is, that there is little Reason to think, that any Person should receive Benefit from the Administrations of such as have not their Authority from God. And if there be

Repl

Person to think so, then I suppose, you think otherwise; unless you think against Reason: And this is the whole of what I fixed upon you. Besides, in this *Second Part of your Defense*, you often say, you cannot Censure some Irregular Persons as Acting without Authority, because some receive Benefit from their Administrations. Now, if this success can be found, where there is no authority; then it can be no Reason to induce you to think that these Persons act by Authority: But if you think, success cannot be, where Authority is wanting, then the *Benefit of Spiritual Administrations, must, according to You, and upon the Authority of Him that Administers.* So that, I see not, but that you must still either own this Principle be Yours, or give up your Argument on Success to Authority. But, before produce those Passages out of your former Writings, in my own Vindication, give me leave to wonder a little at your unaccountable Dealing with me, this Head. You blame me severely representing you as agreeing with *Mr. Dodwell*, in this one Principle, That *Benefit of Spiritual Administrations depends*

pend upon the *Authority of Him that Authorizes* ministers. In Answer to this, you own here, that it is your *firm Persuasion*, that where there is no *Authority*, there is little Reason to expect Benefit to any Person. And I have shewn before that where there is Benefit received, there you think it reasonable to acknowledge an *Authority*. And again, a little after, in the *Page*, you tell me, that *You are the more against my Principle, because it appears to you to tend towards this; i. e. excluding the People from the Benefit of Spiritual Ministrations, that are not under a Ministry of such a particular sort.* The *Principle*, which only you can mean, is that which you say, that God cannot be supposed to approve of *Irregular Ordinations* without a necessity; or to give *Authority* to such as necessarily neglect a *Regular, Lawful* Method of coming into the Ministry. Now from this *Principle*, you likewise say, that *uncharitable Conclusion* naturally follows. And yet at the same time, it is very evident, that you can with Reason say, either that my *Principle* appears to you to tend to this; or that my *Conclusion* naturally follows from it; unless you maintain, that the *People*

have no Benefit, where the Person Administering hath no Authority. For my Principle touches only the Authority of the Minister. The Conclusion mentioned, I deny, upon the most evident Reasons, taken from the Goodness, and Justice of Almighty God. And, if it be not still your Opinion, that the Benefit of the Administrations depends upon the Authority of Him that Administers; it is impossible that my Principle should appear to You to tend to this Conclusion; or this Conclusion be thought by You naturally to follow from it: Because this Conclusion cannot follow, unless upon the supposal of such a dependence. But, you say, my Principle appears to You to tend to this; nay, that this naturally follows from it. Therefore, I conclude, that this is still your Opinion. And now, what is it you can complain of in me? Have I said more than you your self have said in this very place? If not, what is the meaning of this solemn Profession that follows, that you are as remote, as any Man Living, from thinking, that the want of an outward formality in the conferring Authority, shall exclude from Benefit; or that God sends one into the Ministry, but in such a particular



ticular way; so as that such as are not under a Ministry of this, or that, particular Form, must be left to the uncovenanted Mercy of God; which you take to be the distinguishing Principle of Mr. Dodwell upon this Head. Is this the Method you take of insinuating what you please in to your Readers concerning me? Did I ever Tax you with agreeing with Mr. Dodwell in these Opinions? You might as well have intimated, that I taxed you with agreeing with Him in the indispensable and absolute necessity of Episcopal Ordination, and a Regular Succession; for these likewise, are his distinguishing Principles upon this Head. Because I say, you agree with Him in One which is his general Principle; doth it follow that therefore I say, you agree with Him in the particular Principles under it? Because I say, you agree with Him in this, that in order to the Validity of Spiritual Ordinances, it is requisite that the Person who Administer them, should have, some way or other Authority from God; doth it, therefore follow, that I say, you agree with Him in holding, that the want of an outward Formality in the conferring Authority, <sup>deprives</sup>

deprive the People of Benefit? I cannot but be amazed at such Behaviour. I taxed you with holding *one* Opinion: And you *resent* this highly at my Hands, not because you do not hold *that*, which only I fixed upon you; but because you are as *remote* as any *Man Living*, from holding several *other* Points, wholly different from this; with which I taxed you not: As if, because you could not deny the Truth of what I said, therefore you would make your People believe, that I said a great deal more than I said, in order to perswade them that I had injured you.

But in order to shew the Truth and Justice of what I said, *viz.* that it is, or was, your *Principle*, that the *Benefit of Spiritual Administrations* depends upon the *Autority of Him that Administers*; which is the *whole* of what I fixed upon you; besides what I have now urged from this very Page, in which you defend your self from it, I must refer you to some Passages, which induced me to fix this *Principle* upon you; little imagining I confels, that you could possibly Renounce it, without retracting what you had before written. P. I.

## A Reply

of your *Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity*, p. 218. You say, *To suppose this, (i. e. a special Divine Influence which You look upon as necessary to the People's receiving Benefit) ordinarily afforded in the Case of Persons whom God never sent, is to represent God as contributing to the subverting of Order in his Church.* By which I understood, that let People be never so Honest, and never so well Qualified to receive Benefit; (for we can speak only of such in this Affair;) yet it is incredible, That, ordinarily speaking, God should grant them any Benefit, if their *Minister* should not Act by his *Authority*; and that it must be your Opinion, that in all *ordinary Cases* (and I am perfectly at a loss, what Cases you will except, I'm sure, I thought of none but *ordinary Cases*;) the *Benefit* of the People depends upon the *Authority* of Him that Administers. In the mean while, I am taxed with Uncharitableness, who maintain, that God will sooner do what may be Mis-interpreted, so as to give occasion to the disturbance and neglect of *Order*, and *Regularity*, than any sincere Believer, duly qualified for his Favour, shall suffer for the Neg-

lect, or Mistake of another, in a Matter of such Moment, as his *Eternal Salvation*. Again, p. 225. *The Re-ordination of our Ministers*, say you, would create universal Scruples, as to their foregoing Ministrations. For if it be owned, their Ministry was not valid, then their Baptisms were not valid. And, therefore, We must all be Re-baptized. The generality of our Ministers must be Re-baptized, before they are Ordained. And many Thousands of all Ranks through the Kingdom must be Baptized, or they can't regularly come to the Lord's Table. And presently after, In this Case I can see no Salvo. A Man (p. 226.) that observes him that Baptized him, owning that He was no Minister, naturally concludes, that then He was not rightly Baptized. And here again, You call upon me to shew You, how I'll reconcile the Validity of your Baptisms, with the Nullity of your Ministry, p. 227. In comparing a Scruple about Occasional Conformity, with a Scruple about the Validity of Baptism administred by those who had no Authority, You call this latter, a just Scruple; and a Scruple bottomed upon Scripture. And you add, That condemning your selves, by submitting to



Re-ordination, You shou'd condemn your People, and put them under a Necessity of repeating the Solemnity of Baptism, as to themselves, and their Children. Then follows, in so many Words, For tho' our Author seem of another Mind, yet I can't see, how our Baptisms can be owned, if our Ministry is disowned; or how our applying the Seals of the Covenant can be valid, if we Act without a Commission. What can be plainer than these Passages? It is Evident that here is your own Opinion delivered, and that in Opposition to mine, and in the very Expressions us'd by Mr. Dodwell. And these Things are so Evident, that I cannot but wonder, You should not think it more becoming, to acknowledge your self to have been Mistaken, than to pretend, against the clearest Light, that in these Passages, You Express not your own Sense of this Matter, so much as intimate the Scruples which would be this way occasioned, as You do, p. 407. P. II. and particularly, in that Passage, wherein You declare, That if it be owned that your Ministry is not valid, then your Baptisms are not valid. Pray, Sir, Read, and consider, the foregoing Passages; and think it not light

light Matter, to consult your own Reputation, at the Expence of your Neighbours, without the least Shadow of Reason. You will find, upon second Thoughts, that the Case is too plain to bear such palpable Evasions as this. You say, plainly, *If it be owned that our Ministry is not valid, We must all be Re-baptized: And the generality of Ministers must be Re-baptized, viz. such as were not Baptized by Episcopal Clergy.* Doth this look, as if you were expressing only the *Scruples* of your People, and not your own Sense, and that of your Brethren? You add, *In this Case I can see no Salvo.* You call upon me, to reconcile the *Validity of your Baptisms, with the Nullity of your Ministry*: Which implies, That you know not how it can possibly be done. You say, the *Scruples* of your People on this Head, are just, and bottomed upon Scripture; and that You should, by being Re-ordained, put them under a necessity of being Re-baptized. Then you oppose your own Opinion to Mine; and, with Reference only to your self, you expressly say, That You cannot see (tho' I can) how your Baptisms can be owned, if your Ministry be

*disowned.* Are these Passages fairly cited, or are they not? And if they be, can you possibly think that any Man of common Sense can believe, that you spoke not *your own Sense*, where you say plainly that you do speak your own Sense; or, that it was your Opinion these *Scruples* were not reasonable, when you said they were *Just*, and *Scriptural*; or, that you agreed with *Me*, where you said your self, you differ'd from me; or that you never entertained that Principle of Mr. *Dodwell's* I mentioned, when you have owned it for your own Opinion, in the very Words, in which He himself often expresth it? The *Evidence* of this Case, and your Behaviour in it, makes me very sensible, how hard it is for Ingenious Men, in Controversie, to acknowledge an Error, or to condescend to the least *Retraction*. But, notwithstanding all that I have said, assure your self it will be no great Surprize to me now, to see you persist still in the same *Charge*: Especially since I find that you cannot so much as consider my defending the Power of the *Bishops*, to prescribe for the Decency of *God's* Worship, without declaring, that

you think it no *Argument of an extraor. Introd.*  
*inary Christian Temper*: Which severe P. 66.

Censure (founded upon a supposed hard Consequence, and a Consequence never, as you know of, so much as thought of by me;) I fear you will never be able to Reconcile, even with the most ordinary *Christian Charity*. And so I leave this Head: Only remarking, that your Taxing me with want of *Charity*, on another, and different Account from these now mentioned, is past over by you, without either acknowledging the Severity of the *Censure*, or defending the Justice, and Reasonableness of it.

2. I took Notice, that your Representations of my manner of Writing, were such, as were apt to induce your People to think that I had handled your Cause, with a great deal of *Violence*, and *Contempt*, when, at the same time I observed that you could not, as I knew of, produce one Contemptuous, or violent Word. Your Answer is, That the manner of *Writing differs according to the different Genius of the Writers*; that you do not think what I have said, on the Head of Ordination, *Tolerable*; and that my



my being so Mistaken, as not to think your Ordinations approved of God would have justified some Warmth. And this Reply you think worthy of you, and very satisfactory Account, why you should represent *One*, as running down your Ordinations with Contempt, and Violence, out of whom you do not so much as pretend to produce one Contemptuous, or violent Word, upon the Head.

But upon the Business of your Occasional Conformity, you are resolved, seems, still to represent me as *One*, who give hard, and bitter Words: And that upon this Account only, that I say, creates endless Scruples, in your People that they have been filled with Amazement and Uneasiness, and have not known what way to turn themselves; and perhaps have been induced by it, to stretch their own Consciences a little, &c. That this did not naturally offer it self, when I was considering your Argument against Reordination, built upon the meer Scruples of the People; it is impossible for you to shew. That it hath created Scruples in a considerable Number of your People; That it hath been filled with Amazement, &c. is manifest.

manifest from the Writings Published amongst your selves upon this Subject: And, besides the Notoriety, and plainness of the Matter, that *they have perhaps been induced by it to stretch their Consciences*, &c. is very evident from the same Writings, and from your own *Abridgment of the Life of Mr. Baxter*, p. 366. where you tell us, that it hath been objected to you by some, that your *Occasional Communicating with the Establishment Church, which You thought Lawful, led Others (without a perhaps) in imitation of You, to such a Compliance, as they judged Sinful*. This is more than I said of it, and more positively asserted: Yet you deny not the Matter of Fact, but answer, plainly taking it to be true. How then can you find Fault with me, who have not expressed my self so hardly, as your own Words would have led me to do? Or how can you say there is any *Bitterness* in Expressions, that charge no Guilt upon any particular Person in the World, but only mention an ill Consequence arising from a Practice; and this acknowledged by the Defenders of the *Practice* themselves?

But

## A Reply

But lest I should think my self too perfect a Master of my own Temper, in this Controversie, and too free from those Faults which I think unbecoming a Christian, you are willing to lay hold of the *Offer I made You*, to retract any Thing I had written, truly blameable any Thing which you should shew me *I had no fair, and just occasion of saying* any Thing that tends to incense, or inflame; any Thing which looked as if it were brought in for *Wit's sake*, or *Fa-  
sion's sake*, or for Railery. And as I first made this Offer voluntarily; not in the least to Boast of my self, as if I thought my whole Behaviour free from all Blame, or my Writings free from Defects; but only in order to correct and amend what is Amis in them, and to make them worthy of a Christian and a lover of Truth: I thank you that you thought it worth your while, to Point out any of those Passages, which you thought Obnoxious, and so to give me an Opportunity of bestowing *second Thoughts* upon them. And being sure that if there be any such still remaining, they are more likely to be discovered *You*, than by any other Person in the World.

World, I renew my Request to you, that you would give your self the Trouble to Remark these, and lay them open: And I shall acknowledge this as the greatest Obligation, I shall ever, probably, receive at your Hands. But, it becomes me just to run over the *Instances* you produce, before I determine any Thing concerning them.

The *Two Passages* in my *Title Pages* I have already shewn, to be perfectly applicable to the *Person*, and the *Cause* I opposed; and, to answer your *Query*, I have made it appear, that *the Case of those Dissenters*, with whom I concerned my self, was exactly *sued by* them. And as they contain nothing in them, but Considerations, of the Evil Consequences of all *Unnecessary Aggravations* of the *Cause of Conformity*; and of the Unreasonableness of *Separation* in order to make the *Church of Christ* more *Perfect*: I appeal to all the World, whether *These* could be brought in for *Faction's* sake, or for *Wit's* sake, or for *Railery*; whether there be any Thing in them tending to incense, and inflame; and above all, whether *Reflexions* upon the good Lives, and *Insinuations*



tions against the Honesty and Integrity of the *Conformists*, can be justly called a *doing something of the same kind*, in imitation of Me. The next Instance taken out of the Preface to my First Book, where I say, *We, who seriously Conform as Ministers to this Church, cannot be willing to be accounted what no Christian ought to be: And cannot be Content to sit down, and suffer our Practice, to be represented as a Complication of the Blackest, and most unpardonable Crimes.* Upon which you ask, *Doth not this tend to Incense? And that needlessly too, when you know, we make such allowance for different degrees of Light among several Persons?* To which I Answer, by asking You, whether in that Tenth Chapter, in which I replied, the *Practice of Ministers, who Conform to the Terms imposed in the Church of England*, be not represented, as what is, in Your Opinion, a *Complication of the blackest, and most unpardonable Crimes.* You could not think, that I meant by this Sentence that it was Represented by you, as a *Complication of Crimes* in our own Opinions; nor could any Reader in the World think so. And if it be true that

our *Practice* is there represented, as what is so, in *Your* Opinions, and what *You* account so (as I could shew it is, from numberless Particulars) then this Sentence, even separated from the rest of the Paragraph, is not needlessly incensing; but just, necessary, and unavoidable Observation upon that Chapter I undertook to consider. For the *Question* here is not, what allowances *You* make for different degrees of *Light*: But how you have represented your own Opinions about Ministerial Conformity, which is our Practice. And that I say again is done so, so openly to declare to the World, that you esteem it a *Complication of great, and unpardonable Crimes*. But if you had been willing to deal candidly and intenuously in this Case, you would have been glad to have transcribed a *Passage* or Two more, which are added to *this*. And the Trouble would not have been very great; because they are in the very same Paragraph, and could not well have been avoided by a candid and fairable Eye. Let your *Readers*, therefore, know, that I expressly add, That such *Accusations against Ministerial Conformity* be received, as built upon good Grounds,

*Grounds, the Consequence will be that We must be accounted guilty of many, and great Crimes amongst those who embrace them. Let them know farther, that expressly vindicate You from any ill design upon the Reputation of your Neighbours; and add, by way of Explication of what went before, that considering the manner of your Representations, and the Insinuations often drop'd, it is too probable Multitudes will be led by them to judge Ministerial Conformity a Sin of a very big Nature: And consequently, many, who may think the Case very plain, be led to Censure the Conforming Clergy, especially the most Understanding of them as Men of little Honesty and Integrity. The preventing of which Evil Consequence, I said was one End of my Writing. Let your Readers, I say, but know (besides that the Sentence it self is literally true, in the only Sense of which it is capable;) that it is accompanied with these other Sentences, in the same Paragraph: And I doubt not, they will acknowledge that I had Reason, and Justice on my side, in this Observation whether they approve of the Representations made in your Tenth Chapter, or*

not. But this is not all I have to say here; for I think it but reasonable to give you one remarkable instance out of that *Tenth Chapter*, to which only I refer'd, of that great care you take, to make *such allowances for different Degrees of light among several Persons*: by which it will appear, that you have but little reason to allege this in the Justification of your Self, and those, whose Cause is there pleaded. It is in the *510th. Page* of your *Abridgment*: where you quote these Words, (which I suppose you would not have done, unless you had approved of them) from one of the *Silenc'd Ministers*, upon the Case of denying Baptism to such Infants as have not *Godfathers, and Godmothers*. Besides the *Impiety, and Irreligion of such a Process, the Minister, according to his own Faith, would be most cruel and unmerciful in so doing, and deserved, if possible, to be Unchristen'd himself again, and turned among Canibals, as one more deeply Dip'd, and Baptized in their Barbarous Inhumanity, than any of themselves: And yet if He be a true Son of the Church, He must not Baptize, &c.* Judge from hence, whether you



you have taken care to *make* this boasted *allowance* for different degrees of Light; or whether this *Chapter* be a bare Representation of your Arguments against the *Terms* of *Conformity*, and contain not in it any unhandsome *Aggravations*; such as are *unnecessary* to the *Cause*, even in your own Opinions; and such as we have Reason to complain of.

p. 380.

In the next place, You ask me, what *Just and Fair Occasion* I had for Insinuating in the same *Preface* that *Your Abridgment* had been recommended to the People, even from the *Pulpits*: When I should have said, it seems, from the *Prefs*. The Truth of this important Matter is this. I had read a Remarkable Printed Sermon, of a celebrated *Nonconformist Preacher*; in a Marginal Note to which, upon Occasion of Speaking of the *Terms* of *Conformity*, Your *Abridgment* is in a very particular manner *Recommended*. Now my Memory, it seems, failed me; for I had forgotten so far, as to think this *Recommendation* had been in the *Sermon* it self: But little thought this could ever have been accounted a *Crime* in *Me*, or an *Injury* to *You*. That it proceeded from no evil

evil Principle; that there is nothing Severe, or Incensing, or Material, in the Mistake; is too Evident to be denied: Because indeed a Recommendation from the *Press*, is of more Universal Extent, and Influence, than a Recommendation from a *Pulpit* can be. But I am very willing to Retract: And tho' I will not warn all my Readers to *Expunge that passage* (which I know not why You should expect;) yet I here publicly give them notice, that, whereas I said that your Book *had been Recommended from the Pulpits*; I have now found, that the Recommendation I Referr'd to, was not in the *Sermon* it self, as it 'was Preached; but in a very Remarkable Marginal Note, added to it when it was Printed: Which is, indeed of much more Moment, than what I had, thro' forgetfulness, said of this Nature before. This, I hope, therefore, will give you no farther Disturbance.

Again, You ask me, *Was it not a little hard, and bitter, and doth it not tend to Incense, for You to tell the Ejected Ministers, that You can hardly persuade your Selves, that they believe as they*  
 O 2 Speak?

Speak? Could You say *any thing much worse of any Men?* &c. In Answer to this, I must observe that it is easie to make any Sentence appear *hard*, and *bitter*, by separating it from the rest of the *Paragraph*, and considering the *manner* only of Expression, not the *Thing* intended by it. You tell us, you cannot concur in the notion of a *Regeneration at Baptism*, for fear of contributing to the *hardening of careless Men*, in the *Opinion* that they need no farther care: Whereas, we think, that this very Doctrine is an Argument for the greatest care imaginable. And when any thing appears extremely Evident, it is the most usual thing in the World to use such Expressions as are not designed to be taken Literally, but only to express that great Evidence. And thus, when any Opinion is taken by some to lead to such a particular Consequence, which appears to others most evidently, and most naturally to lead to the direct contrary; it hath never been thought either *hard*, or *bitter*, to Express this contrary Judgment, after this manner, *The contrary is so evident to us, that we can hardly persuade our Selves, that You Believe as You Speak, when You say, You think otherwise.* The whole

whole that I designed in that Expression, was to signify the great Evidence We thought we had for differing from You. But since you are displeased with the Expression, and another will serve my purpose as well, I promise you to alter it, if ever it lye in my power: And in the mean while, I assure You, in the Literal Sense of the Words, that, if you now say, that you have the same Opinion still, I do *believe that You speak as You think*. But, taking this Sentence in the Literal Sense, and by it self, I wonder you should ask, whether I could say *any thing much worse of any Men*; when it doth not necessarily imply any thing *evil of you*: for it implies only, that if we be perswaded that you here speak as you think, it is not from the *Reasonableness* of the Opinion it self, but from some other Considerations; which may, I think, be said of any Persons, without the least *bitterness*, or *hardness*. This Phrase only expresses, that We account the thing it self very strange: But it intimates that, notwithstanding this, We perswade our Selves, *that You believe as You speak*: And therefore, Intimates plainly an Opinion of your Honesty, and



and Sincerity, rather than the contrary.

p. 381.

Your next Instance is, that I have *Represented Persons as pleading* that the Time of Celebrating the Communion was never determined to the Morning, till the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was established. You intimated, You say, *that this hath been Pleaded, with good Reason concerning Kneeling at the Communion; but it is not Capable of being Pleaded, you think, as to the Season of Administration. And if not, You ask me, how I can say, that I have exposed, and ridiculed, no Argument? I Answer, that I know my own Heart, and design very well, and am still very certain, that whatever I have advanced, even against the most inconsiderable of your Arguments, hath been serious, and without the least thought of ridiculing or exposing any thing you have said. And as for this particular; the bare laying the matter before the Reader, will clear it from all Suspicion. In Your *Abridgment*, p. 514. You have these Words, as an Argument, distinguished by it self, against *Kneeling at**

the Communion: tho I confefs I know not what it means, fince it cannot, in your own Opinions, prove the Unlawfulness of it. Suppose a Man should, upon searching Church-History, find, that the Posture of Kneeling at the Communion was never required in the Church, till the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was Established; this alone, tho' He should have nothing farther to allege, might be a valid Reason for his being sly of that posture: But for Ministers to enter into any such Combination, as to be obliged to tell such a Man, when offering himself to Communion; truly, Sir, while you are under this Scruple, tho' I may pity You for your weakness, yet I can't own you for a Christian, this they thought hard. This is the whole Sentence; from whence it appears, that you put the Case of a Man, who finds, (or, which is the same, thinks He finds,) in Church-History, that Kneeling was not ordered at the Communion, before the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was Established: And upon this account scruples it. This tho' a weakness, yet you judge it a sufficient Reason why the Minister should not insist upon his Kneeling. In Answer

## A Reply

swer to this, I am Arguing with you entirely, upon what I had reason to call your own Principles: And I put the Case of a Man, who *should think He finds in Church-History, that the Morning was not appointed for the Communion, till Transubstantiation was Etablisbed*; and upon that account should scruple that time. And I say, that those Ministers who were ready to comply with this prescription of the *Time*, tho' some should scruple it; might as lawfully comply with the Prescription of the *Posture*, tho' some should scruple it: And are as much obliged not to confine themselves to the *Time*, as not to confine themselves to the *Posture*. The only *Question* here is, whether this be any thing like *ridicule*; or whether this be not a *fair*, and *parallel* Supposition, as far as the present Argument required. For the Point is not, whether there be as much ground for People to believe that the *Morning-Celebration* of the *Communion* came in with *Transubstantiation*, as that the posture of *Kneeling* did: which are both equally probable as far as the nature of the thing is concerned. And I can tell you, <sup>that</sup>

that great Man Arch-Bishop Tillotson, reconciled a scrupulous Person to the *Posture of Kneeling*, only by shewing, that the like Objections lay against the usual *Time of Celebration*; which yet was not at all scrupled. But the *point* here is, whether the *Case* supposed (and in this place, only *Supposed*) by you, and the *Scruple* consequent upon it, be a greater *Argument* against your Compliance with the Imposition of the *Posture*, than the *Case* *Supposed* by me, and the *Scruple* consequent upon it, be against your *Compliance* with the Imposition of the *Time*. Your Argument here, is only taken from a *supposed Case*; and would be exactly the same, were there no such Person in the World as you there speak of: Because it is possible there may be. My *Answer* is also taken from a *supposed Case*; and is very applicable to this Argument, even supposing there be not any such Person in the World as I speak of: Because it is very possible there may be; and because we have seen in our own days, a thousand times more unaccountable Mistakes owned, and professed amongst *Christians*. But certainly,



## A Reply

certainly, whether the *Case* I supposed be pertinent or not; *He* must be at a great loss for something to lay to my Charge, that can tax me with *ridiculing* his Arguments on this account: When, if you make the worst of it, it can amount to no more than the mistake of *putting a Case not parallel* to yours. It is certainly as free from any thing of *ridicule* as it could be were it the most proper *Instance*, in your own Opinion: And, as far as I can see, it is as proper, and as *parallel* a *Case*, as I could have thought of when I was considering that part of your Argument.

Again, You ask, *Is it not a little hard and bitter, for you to say, that the Difference between the Dissenters and You is not whether there shall be Impositions, or no, but whether they shall be such as Theirs, or Yours.* I answer, Far from the least *hardness*, or *bitterness* supposing it were my Opinion, even supposing this Opinion founded upon *mistake*. For what signifies it to me *hardness* or *bitterness* of it, if you could prove that I was mistaken? And shall you do towards the proving it

or bitter, is to ask, *whether I can reconcile it with Truth*: As if every mistake a Man may be guilty of, must necessarily be hard and bitter. Whether I can Reconcile this with the *Proposals* made in your name by the *Commissioners* at the Savoy, or by any afterwards, is very foreign to this matter: Tho' I hope to make it evident, in it's due place, that the *Proposers* on your side, would have complied with the Establishment, tho' some Impositions were left in it; which is the utmost of what I ever laid upon *them*. But this *Sentence* wholly belongs to another matter: And is a Consequence drawn from two preceding *Instances*; the one of Mr. Baxter, who shewed himself *or Impositions*, when He was fixed at *Geerminster*; the other of the *Independents*, whom you all own to be for *impositions*, tho' of another nature from *ours*. From these two *Instances*, to claim that you your self cannot deny the Truth of them, I make this obvious, and unavoidable *Reflexion*, that the *Dispute* between us, and you, is not whether there shall be any Impositions, no, but whether they shall be such as

Quis

## A Reply

Ours, or Yours; whether the Bishops shall prescribe what they think fit, or whether every particular Minister shall be left to himself to make what Terms of Communion He thinks fit. I argue here, only from fact, (whatever Propositions there have been, or may be made;) that it is too probable from these Instances, that every particular Minister thinks He hath a right to make Terms of Communion for his own Congregation, and will exercise this Right upon all occasions. Had I said this with Relation to the *Proposals* at any time made, on your side; you might then have asked me, *How I could Reconcile it with those Proposals?* But since it is a Reflexion made only upon the *Instances* before given, you should only have asked, *How I could Reconcile it with those Instances?* And yet, if I could not Reconcile it with them, it would not presently follow, that it was either *hard*, or *bitter*.

In my *Second Part*, You tax me with *Banter*, rather than *Argument*, in the *Formal Speech*, as you call it, which I make, p. 17. *When I take upon me to personate an Ejected Minister; And*

you ask me, how I can reconcile it with their avowed Principles, and the circumstances of those times. My design in it, was only to shew, what such a Minister as I personated, might with Justice, and Reason, say to his People: And I doubt not but I shall be able to prove the Justice, and Reason of it, in it's proper place. But this belongs not to our present purpose: And I wonder again what it can signifie here to ask, how I can Reconcile this to their avowed Principles? Were I obliged to this; and had I mistaken their Principles; how can this prove me Guilty of *Banter*? I am sure a Man may be very serious, when He is mistaken: and for my own part, I am so unwilling that it should be thought, I could permit my self to *Banter* in so serious a matter, that I profess, I never was farther from it, than when I wrote those Pages; and took as much care as possible, that the *Reader* should have no such thought. And I hope I may desire every Body to look into them, before they believe this Accusation; and see, whether they can find the least thought, or expression in them.

An-



Another Instance is, that I represent the *Dissenting Ministers*, as *not caring that the People*, who adhere to them, *should be sensible what it is they leave* when they leave the Church of England: as if you could ever perwade the World to believe, that you make the most favourable *Representations of Lay-Conformity* to your People, or often entertain them with those Commendations, which are justly due to the *Form of Worship* Establiſhed; as if that very *Tenth Chapter*, which then lay before me, were not a sufficient Demonstration, that you can with some vehemence lay open the worst side of the *Church of England*; and as if it were not manifest from experience, and from the Testimony of such as were once amongst you, that your *People* are too often ignorant of what it concerns them to know, concerning the *Establiſhed Church*; which they could not be, were there not good ground for this Representation. And what if some few amongst you, in these parts, now and then give a favourable word to the *Establiſhed Worship*? It is evident, beyond contradiction, that a vast majori-

iority of you, take not due care that Your People should know the best side of things; or what that *Worship* is, which they leave, when they leave our Church. This therefore is, in it self, no unjust *censure*; nor expressed with the least *bitterness*: but a true *Observation* made upon what, if it were altered, might very much tend to our Peace, and Union.

But I say that you *Dissenters* have written for many *Tears* with such a *Condemnation* against the Church of England, that you could hardly *Write* with more against the Church of Rome it self: and this is not like one, who hath avoided what ever might offend, as far as it was possible.

Now I think this not at all contrary to the profession I made. For I think it impossible that any one who hath read your Writings, should avoid making this Observation; and I think it very fitting, and becoming a *Christian*, to put you in mind of it: That such heavy Aggravations should not be continued against such a Church. And I appeal, at present, only to your *Tenth Chapter*, which it is easie for any one to turn to, whether it may not be affirmed

firmed justly, *that you could hardly Write with more concern against the Church of Rome, than is there expressed against the Church of England, in it's present Constitution.* For it is not your acknowledging the *Worship* of it to be *materially* lawful, that will prove the contrary: But a judgment must be made, from the many severe, and vehement Expressions, and hard Representations used, in the many Books published on your part, and *there abridged by You.* And certainly, there can be no crime in minding you of *this*; only in order to induce you to consider, and not to proceed in such a method as must grievously offend your Conforming Brethren, and harden your People in their Aversion to the Church of England.

These are all the *Instances* you produce: And I have no reason to think that, if there had been any *Pages*, in my Books, of a worse nature you would have passed them over. And tho' you be not content with producing *these*, without Insinuating that many *more* might be collected; yet am apt to hope that more favourable Judges will conclude that there cannot

be many very *obnoxious* Passages behind; when they consider what these are, which you have already produced; how little there is in them, of what you would fix upon them; and how small a Resemblance they bear, to those Things which I first complained of to You.

The *third* Thing I complained of was the *Account you gave the World of my little regard to Peace, and Union*. And under this, I produced your own Words at large, and what I blamed in you, I told you in plain Words, was this, That you lay to my Charge, that I am for retaining all the *Ecclesiastical Impositions*; that I have an incurable *Fondness for them*; that my Business hath been to persuade you, that *Things are as they should be*; that I seem as fond of the *Impositions as those that fixed them*; that I have pretended that the *Terms of Concomity are as good as You could wish them*; and that by my good-will, I'd hardly part with a Pin out of the *Tabernacle, tho' Union might be the Consequence*. And after I have produced many Passages out of my own Writings, diametrically opposite to this; which shew, That I am not for retaining all the *Ecclesiastical*

Impo-

P



## A. Reply

*Impositions; that I have not an incurable Fondness for them; that I have not pretended that the Terms of Conformity are as good as You could wish them; and that I would part with many Things for the sake of Peace, and Union: I say, after I have produced these Passages, I press it upon you, as a Duty, to make a Reparation for this Injury you have done me, as Publick as the Injury it self, &c. To this you reply, That you see no Reason yet, to unsay what you have said: And, as for Publick Reparation, it is sufficient, if you be ready to give it, where it is due. Let us then see, how justly you persist in this Treatment of me. First, you say, I have asserted a Power in Bishops to impose Rites and Ceremonies in the Church: And you intimate, That I have asserted that this Power must be acknowledged by all who fall in with the Constitution. As for this latter; it is wholly your own Invention, and gives me only a fresh occasion of wondering at this Liberty you give your self. As to the former, I own it is my Opinion yet, that Bishops have a Power of prescribing for the Order, and Decency of Publick Worship; tho', as to the insisting upon*

P. 382.

P. 387.

their Prescriptions when scrupled, I have only argued upon your own Principles, and shewn the Invalidity of some particular Arguments. But now, I pray, Sir, consider what a *Reply* this is. Did I complain of you, because you Taxed me with holding this Power in *Bishops*? If not, what is this to our purpose? Or, doth it follow, because I am of Opinion that *Bishops* may prescribe in the *Worship* of God, that, therefore, I am for retaining all our Ecclesiastical Impositions; that, therefore, I have an incurable Fondness for them; and that I would not, by my good Will, part with one of them for the sake of Peace? Remember what it was I complained of, under this Head; and do not defend it by saying something as different from it as possible. Governours may maintain, that there is a Power in themselves to make *Prescriptions*: And yet they themselves may often see occasion for Compliance, and Condescension; and, very consistently with themselves, may give up many Things to the sole Consideration of Peace. And surely then, I may hold such a Power in *Bishops*; and yet be as far from what you laid to my

## A Reply

my Charge, as you your self, who hold no such Power to be in them. But to pursue your Accusation, you remark, That it is my Opinion that our Governours have by their Publick Declarations prevented, and answered the Objections of the *Scrupulous*. If so, say you, what need can there be of Amendments? Or, why should you yield to them? You may as well say, that I hold Conformity to our Church, Lawful; and, therefore, cannot yield to any Amendments: As You, likewise, do; and yet would have many Amendments. Put the Case now, that I think, the Objections of the *Scrupulous* have been sufficiently answered, about the lawfulness of *Kneeling* at the Sacrament: So do You your self; or otherwise you could not think it Lawful. Let us see then, how it follows that, upon this Account, it is impossible I should yield to the leaving this Posture indifferent. You will not allow it a good Consequence, on your side: And how then can it follow, on my side? Or how can you say, that I may not yield to an Alteration of it, for the sake of those, who still continue to Scruple it, as Unlawful; because, I my self think it Lawful.

Lawful, and their Objections not well grounded? Or, how doth it follow, that I must not think there may be *need of Amendments* in other Respects, because I think that our Governours have shewn the Lawfulness of complying with one, or two, of their Prescriptions? I say, That *the Objections of the Scrupulous, have been answered*: Therefore, *I can yield to no Alterations for the sake of Peace*; therefore, *I have an incurable Fondness for the Impositions*; and the like. What Reasoning is here brought; only left you should have the Dishonour of owning, that you drew up this Charge against me without Reason? But once more; you say it is my Opinion, that the Governours of the Church have ordered nothing, but what, if all would seriously comply, is certainly for the good of the Church. And, if so, you add, *how can You yield to Alterations? How can You part with one Pin out of the Tabernacle, tho' Union might be the Consequence?* Give me leave to Instance in one Prescription of those Three, concerning which particularly I am speaking, in the Page you Quote. Suppose *all would seriously* procure fitting



*Sponsors* for their Children, who, to the Parents Care should joyn their Instructions: I say, this would be for the good of the *Church*: And yet, because very many do this after a very slight manner, and not seriously, I may be willing, it should not be required of all; and because many scruple the Lawfulness of it, I may, very consistently with my self, yield to the Alteration of it, and give it up to the Consideration of Peace. Will not you give me leave to think, as you do, that *Peace* is a greater good to the Church, than the rigorous Imposition of what many will not comply with; and must not You, your self, acknowledge that I may think well of this *Imposition*, if all would seriously comply with it; and yet yield to the Alteration of it, because all will not seriously comply with it?

And now look back upon these Heads of Accusation you drew up against me, as I have again laid them before You: And see, if You can think your *Defence* of any relation to my *Complaint*; or, whether it had not better become You, to have publicly revoked so unjust a Charge, than to have endeavoured still  
to

to continue it after this manner? And tho' You have hitherto disdained *Publick Reparation*; yet I cannot help reminding You, that there is a solemn Account to come, in which we are to Answer for every hard, and injurious Word. But if you think fit still to proceed in this manner, and particularly in such manifest Instances, I hope I shall be ever ready to forgive You: But I know not whether it can be to any purpose for me to Concern my self any farther with your *Replies*: For it is in your Power, at this Rate, to Tax me with what You please, and to give your *Reasons* as much Reason to believe it, as You have produced under this Head; and therefore wholly out of my own Power to guard against such an *Adversary*.

I had expressed a Wonder, that You should say in your *First Part*, p. 15. that *I had said nothing to a great Difficulty* there proposed, about the fear of more Ceremonies: Whereas I refer'd You to the Place, where I had distinctly considered it. And your *Reply* to this bears a great Resemblance to the rest of your Behaviour towards me. For You say,

P 4

You

You have looked into the *Pages* I refer'd You to, and *can find no Solution of your Difficulty*. Now, who doth not see, that You meant, I had not said any Thing *at all* to that Objection? And who doth not see that my *Wonder* was, that You should say so, when I had endeavour'd to return a particular and exprefs Answer to it? And now, You prove what You said, by affirming, that I have said nothing that You think Satisfactory. Whether it be so, or no, the *Reader* may judge in a more proper Place: But, after this manner, You may say, that I have said nothing to any Objection in your *Tenth Chapter*; and You may prove it, because You can find no *Solution* of your *Difficulties*; nothing which You think Satisfactory.

To my *Postscript* You Answer, That I may state the *Question* as I please, for my Self: And so, You hope, may You. Now your State of it, You often say, is this, *Whether Moderate Non-Conformity be Lawful*. And I think this is much the same with mine, viz. *Whether Lay-Conformity be circumstantially Unlawful*: For if it be not, the *Affirmative* side of  
your

your *Question* can never be made out. If this be so; why should you endeavour to intimate that I differ'd from you in stating the *Question*, rather than joyn in reducing it to what it must necessarily be resolved into at last? Or, how can you think it becoming a *Lover of Truth*, to reject, and pass by my *State of the Question*, without giving any Reason for it, or so much as endeavouring to shew that it is not just, and reasonable? *Your Sense of that Matter*, you tell me, *I shall see sufficiently laid open in your Introduction*. If you mean by that *Matter*, the *Circumstantial Unlawfulness* of the *People's Conformity*, tho' they think the Things imposed, to be, in themselves, *Lawful*; it doth not seem to me to be the *Point* you proposed to your self in that *Introduction*: Nor can I find any Argument *there* advanced sufficient to prove it, but what will hold against all *Compliance*, and regard to *Peace*, even upon your own *Scheme*; and therefore must wait for what you have reserved concerning this Matter, when you shall come to consider what I have said about those *Circumstances* you before fixed upon *Constant Conformity*.



## A Reply

mity. But if you mean any other Matter, you do but deceive your Readers, when you would lead them to think, that your *Introduction* touches the Heart of the *Controversie*: For it is in this, which I have now mentioned, and in nothing else, that the *Heart* of the *Controversie* lies, even as you have chosen to State it your self. And indeed, I never pretended to *Limit*, or *Confine* you, any farther than to oblige you to acknowledge that on *this* the whole of your *Cause* depends, and to leave out of your Writings, such Things (which I particularly mentioned) as tend to draw the Mind aside from the *main Point*; to hurt the Reputation of your Neighbour; to Incense us against one another; and to prolong the *Controversie*: and this, I will venture to say again, without adding one degree of Light to any part of it. And I am sorry that you should think *this* an unbecoming or unpleasant *Confinement*: Or endeavour to make your Reader believe that the *natural Course* of the *Controversie* led you to treat the *Cause* of *Conformity*, and my self, as you have done. Especially, when you give so inconsiderable

a Reason for it, as this, that you did not begin with me; that You had no Eye to me, or to any particular Persons in the Tenth Chapter of your Abridgment: As if such Allegations against the Terms of Conformity were of no Concern to the Conforming Ministers; and as if, because I took the Liberty of offering to the World something in Justification of our Compliance with those Terms, it were Just in You to take the Liberty of treating the Cause, and even the Persons of the Conformists, after such a manner as I am unwilling again to describe.

For my own part, I heartily forgive you: But, indeed, I am very much concerned to find my self engaged with One, who could ever think such Methods of Controversie, becoming, or pardonable. Alas! it is not sufficient, now and then, to drop a favourable Profession, or a good Character: But the only Thing that can bear up the Credit of Religion, in the midst of our Religious Differences, is a sacred, and constant Regard to Justice, Charity, and Truth. As nothing in the World can give us a License to dispense with this; so nothing in the World can recompense the want of

**A Reply, &c.**

of it in us. And therefore, for the sake of that *Religion* we profess, let us shew, by all our future Actions, that we are truly sensible of this. What I have said, you have made necessary; and therefore, I hope, will the more easily Pardon in

S I R,

*Your Friend, and Brother,*

(If You allow it)

B. H.

---

**P I N I S.**

---

## THE

# CONTENTS.

CH A P. I. Of *Episcopal Ordination*,  
Page 2.

CH A P. II. Of the *Declaration of Assent*,  
and *Consent*; and the *Subscription*.

Sect. 1. Of the *Subscription*, p. 6.

Sect. 2. Of the true *Interpretation* of the  
*Declaration*, p. 9.

Sect. 3. Of the *Objection* against the *De-*  
*claration*, and *Subscription*, taken from  
the *Office of Baptism*, &c. p. 34

Sect. 4. Of the *Objection* taken from the  
*Use* of *Godfathers*, &c. p. 49.

Sect. 5. Of the *Objection* taken from the  
*Use* of the *Sign* of the *Cross*. p. 59.

Sect. 6. Of the *Objection* taken from the  
*Office* of *Ordination*, p. 66.

Sect. 7. Of the *Objection* taken from the  
*Burial-Office*, p. 80.

Sect.



## The Contents.

- Sect. 8. Of the *Objection* taken from the  
*Rule for Easter-Day*, p. 9
- Sect. 9. Of the *Objection* taken from the  
*Apocryphal Lesson*, p. 9
- Sect. 10. Of the *Objection* taken from  
the *Misfranklin of the Psalter*, p. 10
- Sect. 11. Of the *Objection* taken from  
the *Athanasian Creed*, p. 10
- Sect. 12. Of the *Objection* taken from  
the *Office of Confirmation*, p. 10

### CH A P. III. Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience,

#### A Reply to Mr. Calamy's Postscript in Answer to the *Serious Admonition*

p. 136